NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXX.

NOVEMBER, 1891.

RUSSIAN BARBARITIES AND THEIR APOLOGIST.

BY THE REV. DR. ADLER, CHIEF RABBI OF THE UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATIONS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

"WOE to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously, and they dealt not treacherously with thee!" (Isaiah XXXIII., 1.) On this text my revered father and predecessor in office based the discourse which he preached on the day of humiliation that was observed during the Crimean War of 1854. I well remember my father, a man of meek and gentle disposition, expressing the fear lest he might have been carried away by his patriotic fervor to level denunciations of too fierce a character against England's foe. But it would seem as though his words were spoken with prophetic foresight, as though he had instinctively felt that the time would come when the words of Isaiah would be but too fully applicable to the Colossus of the North.

We are told by friendly critics that it is not advisable to employ the language of denunciation when referring to the barbarities practised upon the Jews of Russia. Objections are raised to the publication of *Darkest Russia*, a periodical which is issued by the Russo-Jewish Committee in London with the object of bringing to the knowledge of the civilized world authentic facts relating to the persecution of the Jewish and other nonconformist subjects of that empire. It is argued that the publi-

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cation of the facts tends to irritate those invested with high authority at St. Petersburg. I fail altogether to grasp either the wisdom or the justice of these criticisms. Is it not in the power of the authorities at once to remove the source of irritation by staying their persecution? Does oppression "that maketh a wise man mad" become legal, just, and equitable when it is practised in the land of the Czars? Does persecution lose its hateful character because it is directed against the downtrodden, defenceless Hebrew? The hapless victims, indeed, are unable to lift up their voice. They must suffer in silence; they are "oppressed and afflicted and they open not their mouth." The Muscovite press is hopelessly and helplessly gagged. Shall their co-religionists who dwell in the happy land of freedom likewise hold their peace, or only speak "with bated breath and whispering humbleness"? Shall they fold their hands in sluggish apathy? "Deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain. If thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it"? (Proverbs XXIV., 11, 12.) The scriptural monition comes to us with all its native force. And we regard it as our first and obvious duty to place before the world a plain and unvarnished record of the facts, so as to stir and rouse public opinion—public opinion, which, in the memorable words uttered by the Bishop of Ripon at the great Guildhall meeting, "is not the wild hysteria of a few, but the mature judgment of the many; which is the product of the experience of past ages; which is built up in the experience of the bitterness of human outrage; which when it speaks on behalf of mercy is as the voice of God speaking amongst men; which when it speaks on behalf of right is the expression of the opinion of the collective conscience of humanity appealing to the conscience of the one." I readily admit that our publication must be free from exaggeration; that it must rigorously eschew all overdrawn and colored descriptions. We therefore take the utmost pains to gather trustworthy and accurate information; an endeavor which, it need hardly be said, is beset with many difficulties.

But nothing can be more unjust than to stigmatize our narratives as unfounded tales of Muscovite barbarity, or to designate them as idle *canards* proceeding from Jewish sources. Exactly the same deprecatory epithets were levelled at the accounts given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in *The Times* of the persecution of the Jews in 1881 and 1882, until it was demonstrated to the satisfaction of all, with one exception (of which more anon), that they were absolutely authentic matters of fact.

And, being satisfied that our statements are accurate, are we not justified in holding them up to the opprobrium of the civilized world? When Mr. Gladstone, by his famous letter to Lord Aberdeen, made all Europe ring with the story of the sufferings of the prisoners in the dungeons of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, did he then wrap up his statements in sugared words and conventional phraseology? When he felt it his duty to denounce the wrongs that had been committed in Bulgaria, did he permit himself to be muzzled from fear of wounding Turkish susceptibilities? And may we not turn to higher and holier exemplars? When the great seers of old were commissioned to reprove the mighty empires of the East for their oppression and cruelties, did they seek to make their messages palatable by soft flatteries, glossing over all that was vile and contemptible? Did they not portray wrong in all its naked hideousness? Did they not, in words aglow with fiery indignation, teach the immortal lesson that righteousness exalteth a nation, but that ruin and shame will be the inevitable lot of a people that violates the eternal and immutable principles of justice and mercy?

These sacred principles are being flagrantly and violently trodden under foot in the land of the North. It would be beyond the scope of the present article to describe in minute detail the various phases of the persecution to which the Jew of Russia is at present subjected. It may be of advantage to present them in a succinct outline. With the downfall of Ignatieff the outrages which had disgraced the years 1881 and 1882 came to an end. Whether this downfall was brought about, or at least hastened, by the protests raised in the public press, and especially by the memorable meeting at the Mansion House, I will not now stay to inquire. It has been cynically said that the Muscovite does not mind acting brutally, but that he entertains the strongest possible objection to being regarded by others as capable of acting in this fashion. After 1882 we hear no more of bloodshed, pillage, and outrages on women. But other methods were sought to render the lives of the despised Hebrews insupportable. The greatest hardship under which they have suffered from the earliest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period of their settlement was their restriction to fifteen *Gubernia,* besides Poland, as places of residence. These fifteen provinces represent a district of comparatively large area, but lacking in towns of any great commercial importance. Yet the four and a half or five millions who inhabit Russia and Poland managed to earn their subsistence. We hear of them in the towns as the principle traders and artisans,* in the villages as farmers, mill-owners, and dairymen. They were also tacitly permitted to establish themselves in important commercial centres outside the pale of settlement, still greater facilities being given to craftsmen, merchants of the first guild, and those who had received a university education. In the fateful year of 1882, after the excesses had ceased, legislative measures were enacted intended to withdraw all the privileges by which the hardship of the settlement restrictions had, in some measure, been mitigated. The Jews were prohibited from residing outside any of the towns in the pale, and were forbidden to own, farm, or manage landed property. At first these May laws, as they were termed from the month in which they were promulgated, were permitted to remain inoperative. But since the summer of last year they have been enforced by stringent orders from headquarters, with the effect of crowding enormous populations into the congested towns. Artisans are expelled with indignities, as though they were criminals, from cities where they had hitherto gained an honorable subsistence. Men of education are no longer permitted to exercise the professions for which they have been diligently trained. Laws, not inaptly likened to thumbscrews, that had long since fallen into desuetude, are revived and enforced with the utmost rigor, and with a cynical contempt of human rights. Day after day brings us tidings of thousands, who have no fault other than that of being Jews, having been expelled from their homes, and exposed to the most cruel suffering and privation.

What is the result of these measures? The condition of the victims is ineffably sad. Their staff of bread is broken. Instead of enjoying health and vigor, as, owing to their sobriety and temperance, they formerly did, they are now being slowly starved to death. A correspondent testifies: "Among all the population of vast Russia I never met with persons looking more wretched

* There are nearly 300,000 artisans in the fifteen provinces of the pale. Cf. *Données statistiques sur le nombre des Juifs exerçans des métiers,* etc. Saint-Pétersbourg, 1888.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the emaciated Jews. In all Europe there is no class of men who find it harder to earn a morsel of bread than is the case with nine-tenths of the Russian Jews." No wonder, then, that an exodus has commenced as great and as impetuous as that which took place ten years ago. The poor exiles pour forth over the lines of railway leading from the frontier towns of Russia to the ports of Hamburg and Bremen. A correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, giving an account of the scenes that are daily to be witnessed at the Charlottenburg railway station, commences with the quotation: "If you have tears, prepare to shed them now." And he proceeds to describe the utter wretchedness which the arrival of each train discloses. Haggard men and women are there so weak that they are hardly able to walk, children in scanty raiment, and whole families that had lived in comparative affluence driven at a day's notice from their homesteads and the land which, with all its faults, they still loved.

On hearing the sad tale of all this misery, one is naturally anxious to investigate the causes which have induced this persecution. Those best entitled to form a judgment trace it to religious intolerance and to the insensate thirst for Panslavism which has seized upon so many Russian minds. M. Pobiedonostzeff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, who unhappily enjoys the full confidence of the Czar, is a fanatic by conviction, and cannot tolerate that the land should be inhabited by those who do not profess the orthodox creed. Hence persecutions of a similar character, though of less intensity, are enacted against Protestants, Catholics, and especially Uniates (Catholics who use the Slav liturgy). Professer Geffcken* writes: "If the latter refuse to have their children baptized by orthodox popes, they are unsparingly deported. Twenty thousand Uniates alone have been removed from the western provinces to Szaratow. Those who remain at home have Cossacks quartered upon them, and all sorts of compulsory means are resorted to in order to stamp out this sect." Trustworthy information has just reached us of the rigorous treatment to which the Stundists are subjected. Persons suspected of belonging to this sect are declared ineligible for any post or employment connected with the village administration. It would almost seem as though a pale of residence were being created for them. But the persecution of the Jew is of a greatly

*"Russia under Alexander III." *New Review*, September, 1891.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggravated character, and carried on with a more relentless malice, for the following reasons: He is not a Slav, and the watchword has gone forth, "Russia for the Russians." Despite all the obstacles with which he has been hedged, he has thriven. The Jew, whom the Russian hardly ever names without an opprobrious epithet, has outstripped the orthodox Slav in the struggle for life. Hence the present desire to crush and to exterminate the poor Israelite.

But a writer in the August number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW aspires to throw "new light" on this question. Professor Goldwin Smith alleges that the source of the troubles is not religious, but social and economic; that persecution is not the tendency of the Russian or of the church to which he belongs; but that the Jew has brought these calamities upon himself through his parasitic tendencies and his tribal exclusiveness. Verily, these arguments deserve neither to be characterized as light (they resemble rather an *ignis fatuus*) nor can they claim to be regarded as new, seeing that they constitute for the most part the repetition of statements and assertions that were dished up in former articles that appeared in *The Nineteenth Century*. It is not my intention to repeat the arguments with which I traversed my adversary's position touching our alleged tribalism and lack of patriotism, for Mr. Gladstone—no mean arbiter in a controversy—has stated that "when Mr. Goldwin Smith made against the Jews what may be called a charge of incivism, he was met by an effective defence."* Nor need I advert to those arguments which have been answered by Mr. Bendavid in the September number of this REVIEW.†

Before proceeding to answer the specific indictments preferred by this advocate of the Russian Government, I would briefly touch his plea that the Jewish accounts of the atrocities of 1881 and 1882, published in the London *Times*, were in most cases exaggerated and in some to an extravagant degree. Literary encounters with that gentleman on the part of champions immeasurably doughtier than I, notably Mr. Herbert Spencer,‡ have taught me extreme wariness in accepting as final a statement emanating from

*"The Irish Demand," by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1887.

† I do not know what evidence Mr. Bendavid has discovered for the Hebrew descent of Charles Dickens. George Eliot was a profound admirer of the Hebrew genius, but she was not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, of Jewish origin.

‡ "Goldwin Smith as a Critic." *Contemporary Review*, March, 1882.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him. He would palliate the outrages on women committed in 1882 by contending that they could be reduced to half a dozen authenticated cases. I will assume for a moment that this was so. Does this lessen the criminality of the deed? Was not an insult offered by a ruffianly tax-gatherer to one Kentish maiden, the daughter of a tiler of Dartford, sufficient to stir England to rebellion? Mr. Smith commends the reports of the British consuls comprised in two blue-books of 1881 to our earnest study. I join in this recommendation, and would ask the professor to read carefully the second blue-book concerning the treatment of the Jews in Russia (Russia No. 2, 1882). He would find that Sir E. Thornton, H. B. M. ambassador at St. Petersburg, writing to Earl Granville (number 28), encloses an extract from the *Golos* newspaper saying that "in Balta alone cases of violation were numerous. Of these, ten are already known, but the remaining victims are ashamed to come forward." He further writes that an article in the *Golos*, also quoted, admits that the charges brought by foreign newspapers against the administrative abilities of the Russian authorities are but too true, though they may be exaggerated, *but that it is absurd to speak of exaggeration when actual facts are beyond all description.* Could there be a more thorough vindication of the accuracy of the reports of the London *Times?*

But to return to the apology advanced for the anti-Semitic movement in Russia. "The Eastern Church has always been tolerant and free from the stain of persecution." Granted that it was so in former days. Does history not record sudden transformations due to the influence of one masterful mind? And has Russia, indeed, manifested invariably such perfect tolerance? One who has studied the fortunes of Israel in the land of the North will readily remember the horrible sufferings inflicted by Bogdan Chmielnicki, when his hordes of Cossacks swept through Poland intent on pillage and bloodshed, first in 1648, when they murdered many thousands of Jews, and again in 1654, when entire communities in Lithuania were almost completely annihilated, the popes in many cases instigating the massacres.

"The Russian government has never been guilty of persecution. The movement has its main cause in circumstances purely economical, inasmuch as the Hebrews are a parasitic race." On

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the very same day that this imputation was published its falsehood was triumphantly proved by men whose information was not derived at second hand, but who had studied the question on the spot. I refer to the articles on "Jewish Colonization" and "The Russian Persecution," by Mr. Arnold White and Mr. E. B. Lanin, which appeared in *The New Review* of August. In graphic language they portray the activity of the Jews as contrasted with the idleness of the general population. If they succeed in trade better than their Christian competitors, it is because the wares they manufacture are of better quality and are sold at a more reasonable price. In addition to the traders there are hundreds of thousands of able bodied men who are engaged in arduous manual toil. There are the artisans of Berditchew, the wharf-laborers of Odessa, the corn-porters of Nicolaieff, the farm-laborers of Kremenchug, in addition to many thousand agriculturalists settled in various colonies who are marked by all the characteristics of a peasantry of the highest order. But I would especially commend M. Leroy-Beaulieu's great work "L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes" to those who desire to study the question thoroughly. He devotes an entire chapter (Volume III, pp. 613—654) to the condition of the Jews, and examines the charge of parasitism brought against them. One striking argument of his deserves citation :—

"Le Juif, affirme-t-on, a en aversion tout travail productif; c'est essentiellement un exploiteur vivant et s'enrichissant du labeur d'autrui. Cela encore peut être vrai, du moins en un sens. Le Juif n'est, le plus souvent, qu'un intermédiaire entre le producteur et le consommateur, et moins il y a de ces intermédiaires, mieux il vaut pour une société. Mais doit-on pour cela poser en principe que tout marchand, tout négociant, tout intermédiaire est un parasite ? Et si cela est vrai du Juif ou du Sémite, comment ne le serait-ce pas également du Chrétien ou de l'Aryen ? Ne sait-on point que la circulation est une fonction essentielle du corps social, comme de tout corps vivant ?" *

But Mr. Smith's most calumnious and mischievous indictment

* "The Jew, they say, holds all productive labor in aversion; he is essentially a trader, living and enriching himself by the labor of another. This is perhaps true, at least in one sense. The Jew is most frequently only an intermediary between the producer and the consumer, and the less there is of the intermediary the better it is for society. But ought one on this account to lay down the principle that every merchant, trader, and middle-man is a parasite? And if that is true of the Jew or of the Semite, why will it not be equally true of the Christian and the Aryan? Does not everybody know that the circulation is an essential function of the body social, as of every living body?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appears at the close of the article, in the allegation that Nihilism is supposed to be recruited partly from the Jews. It is difficult to use the language of moderation respecting a writer who flings forth an accusation such as this, resting on no more solid a foundation than a mere supposition,—an accusation which might be fraught with the direst consequences to the unhappy people against whom it is recklessly levelled. Such an act is most fitly characterized by the scriptural metaphor of a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows, and death, and says, "Am I not in sport?" Penal codes and social vexations are but too well calculated to sting the Jews of Russia into hatred. But so deeply is the virtue of loyalty ingrained in the Hebrew mind, so ardent is his love of law and order, so profound is his horror of assassination, that the proportion of those who are mixed up with revolutionary plots is extraordinarily small. This is conclusively demonstrated in an article in *Darkest Russia,* entitled, "Are the Russian Jews Dynamite Conspirators?"—where it is shown, by reference to the official lists, that of the thirty persons who were proved to be implicated in the attempts to murder the present Emperor and his august father, there was not one Jew, and only one Jewess, who, however, having linked her fortunes to a person of the orthodox church, could hardly be regarded as a member of the Jewish community.

In dismissing the professor the reflection presses itself upon us. Much might be said in extenuation of the guilt of the Autocrat of all the Russias, shut off, as he is, from the free and wholesome current of public opinion by a dense wall of officialism. Some allowance might even be made for the Procurator of the Holy Synod, who, Torquemada-like, persuades himself that he is working "*in majorem Dei gloriam.*" But no excuse can be offered for one who, privileged to breathe the air of freedom and religious tolerance which wafts through the British Empire, does not hesitate to palliate wrongs, dark and huge as the mountain, and to justify barbarities that cry aloud to heaven for cessation and redress.

But the question forces itself upon every thinking man, "*Quousque tandem?*"—How will this end? An exodus of extraordinary dimensions is progressing. Many thousands emigrate to the United States, that great country whose hospitality is as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unbounded as are its resources, and where they prove themselves diligent, thrifty, and law-abiding citizens. A certain proportion filters into this country, where they have established one branch of industry, the cheap-clothing trade, and largely developed another, the cheap-boot trade. Thanks to the admirable education which their children receive at the Jews' Free School and similar institutions, these foreigners are being slowly but surely assimilated with the population among whom they have chosen to dwell. Large numbers flee to the Holy Land (a veritable Palestine hunger having seized the poor cowed refugees), where several agricultural colonies have been established by the munificence of Baron Edmond de Rothschild and the enterprise of other lovers of Zion. Travellers speak hopefully of the success of these colonies.

It is, however, considered neither wise nor expedient to encourage large settlements of Jews in countries which, like the United States, already number a considerable Hebrew population, or in those which, like our own tight little island, are already over-congested. And here I may mention incidentally that much exaggeration is indulged in concerning the inflow of dense hordes of pauper aliens into London. The publication of the returns issued by the Board of Trade shows very clearly that the increase of the immigration of the Polish Jews into London in the current year, as compared with the last, has been but inconsiderable. But in order to stay all complaints on this head, Baron de Hirsch has propounded a scheme to promote a vast immigration of the Jewish race from Russia to those parts of the world which are as yet sparsely populated. He has devoted two million pounds sterling to the establishment of colonies in various parts of North and South America and certain regions of Africa—colonies for agricultural, commercial, and other purposes. He has enlisted the aid of several men renowned for their great business capacity—men such as Lord Rothschild, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Mr. F. D. Mocatto, Mr. Benjamin Louis Cohen, and M. S. H. Goldschmidt—to aid him in carrying out his colossal scheme. A settlement has already been commenced in the Argentine Republic, and the latest advices I have received speak very encouragingly of the intelligence and industry of the settlers.

And yet, whoever reflects upon the problem will admit that emigration, however large the scale on which it is conducted,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however princely the munificence by which it is subventioned, cannot be viewed as a true solution of the Russo-Jewish question. Emigration can affect but a small proportion of the legion of persecuted Israelites. Even granted that the Czar will let his people go, yet the bulk of the Israelite population must remain behind. They either will not or cannot quit the soil where they have been born and which their fathers inhabited centuries before the Russian appeared there. "Des milliers sont partis; des millions sont restés," says Leroy-Beaulieu;—"Thousands have gone; millions remain." The sovereign remedy for all the ills from which the Jews of Russia have suffered so long is to be found in the one word "Freizügigkeit." Liberty to circulate throughout the length and breadth of the land; freedom to settle in every district of that vast empire, with its eight million square miles and its ample means of subsistence for all its indwellers; the abrogation of every restrictive law and degrading disability. When, when will the Czar pronounce that redeeming word, so that happier days may dawn for his Hebrew subjects, and a new era of prosperity commence for the whole empire?

HERMANN ADLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLEA FOR FREE SILVER.

BY THE HON. D. W. VOORHEES, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM INDIANA.

THE precious metals of the world now in use as money may be estimated as follows :

Gold	$3,727,018,869
Silver	$3,820,371,346

The movement, therefore, in this and other countries for the demonetization of silver, and for its degradation to a commodity such as corn, iron, wheat, and pork, has for its plain and specific purpose the destruction of something more than one-half the specie currency of the world. The human mind can hardly conceive a more tremendous financial revolution or one fraught with graver consequences. If it is claimed, however, that the continued and persistent assaults on silver do not mean its complete extermination as a financial factor, but only its curtailment and limitation, the facts of history arise at once to refute such a claim. The position now assumed by the leading opponents of silver money, to the effect that they simply wish to limit its coinage to the American product and to equalize its circulating value with that of gold, is not a position of choice or free will, but is the result of the coercive power of public opinion. It is the position to which in the last fourteen years they have been driven, step by step, by an awakened and aroused resistance on the part of the people to their actual and original scheme for the total overthrow and extinction of silver money.

The fatal scope of the legislation of 1873, by which silver was demonetized, and the sinister and secret methods then adopted, will be remembered as long as the financial history of this country endures; and the real purpose of the enemies of silver will be understood and interpreted by that legislation, rather than by their present enforced attitude.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The silent and surreptitious elimination of the silver dollar from coinage in 1873, and from circulation as legal-tender except for the sum of five dollars and under, was intended as the death-blow to silver money in this country, and would have remained and operated as such but for the sweeping popular protest which a few years later followed the discovery of the wrong and fraud. The authors of the design against silver at that time played with hidden hands; so much so that the most vigilant representatives in both branches of Congress were deceived, and even the President of the United States, when he signed the bill, was not aware, as his public utterances afterwards disclosed, of the stealthy and destructive step which had been taken.

Now, however, those who eighteen years ago wrought under cover for the destruction of one-half the honest, debt-paying money of the American people, are as well known as if a calcium light had been turned on them, and are as universally distrusted by the plain, laboring, and productive masses as if they had been caught in the commission of crime. This feeling of distrust is confined to no one party. The ablest and most distinguished opponent of silver money in the United States, and, more than any other one man, the author of the legislation of 1873 on that subject, has been before three national conventions of the Republican party seeking a nomination for the Presidency, and seeking it in vain. Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, is always to be spoken of with respect as a man of ability and large experience, and more especially so in connection with the finances of the country. It is true he has been on both sides of every financial issue for more than a quarter of a century past, but it is also true that he has always veered from one point of the compass to the other at the exact time when his services were most valuable to the money power, and most oppressive to the laboring, over-taxed, debt-paying farmers and wage-workers of the country. And yet, with all his eminent services in behalf of the financial centres, as they are called, banking corporations, usurers, interest-eaters, and parasites on human labor generally, the leaders of the Republican party in New York have never dared in national convention to cast the vote of that State for him. The opportunity was presented in 1880, 1884, and 1888, and the weight of obligation which the moneyed interests were under to Mr. Sherman was not denied; but a wholesome fear that the plain people would resent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the polls his hostility to their interests restrained the impulse of gratitude, if, indeed, such a sensation as gratitude is ever known to organized wealth.

In reaching a conclusion adverse to the sincerity, patriotism, and public virtue of the leaders of the crusade against silver money, the American people have been actively and earnestly engaged, especially since 1878, in educating themselves on the subject from every legitimate source of information. They have examined the history of silver from the days of the patriarchs to the present time, in order to ascertain wherein it has been at fault in the world's commerce, trade, and traffic, and why now, near the close of the nineteenth century, it deserves extermination. They have scanned its career as it has come down through all the ages alongside of gold, in order to see where and when it has proved a less honorable money metal, or a less reliable measure of value, than the yellow coin which has borne it company. When some startling crime takes place, when a homicide is committed, the real motive of the perpetrator becomes the subject of anxious and vigilant scrutiny; and so when the assassination of silver money occurred in 1873, it put the American people on notice to discover, if possible, the true meaning of such an unexpected and revolutionary act. They have found nothing in the origin, history, career, or services of silver during the past four thousand years to inspire an honest or patriotic motive for its death. Its origin as money under divine law is the same as that accorded to gold.

In American history the silver dollar has a peculiarly glorious origin, exalted sanction, and useful career.

The paternity of the silver dollar of the United States is due to Thomas Jefferson. In June, 1783, that great leader of political and economic thought in his own country and throughout the world, was appointed by the Legislature of Virginia a delegate to the Continental Congress, and took his seat as such at Trenton on the 4th day of November following. With the achievement of our independence it became necessary to depart from the English system of pounds, shillings, and pence, and to devise a system of currency for ourselves—an American system. In his autobiography, written in 1821, Jefferson, in referring to the proceedings of the Congress whereof he became a member, says:

"They, as early as Jannary 7, 1782, had turned their attention to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moneys current in the several States, and had directed the Financier, Robert Morris, to report to them a table of rates at which the foreign coins should be received at the Treasury. That officer, or rather his assistant, Gouverneur Morris, answered them on the 15th in an able and elaborate statement of the denominations of money current in the several States, and of the comparative value of the foreign coins chiefly in circulation with us. He went into the consideration of the necessity of establishing a standard of value with us, and of the adoption of a money unit."

Jefferson then describes the standard of value and the money unit reported by the Financier to whom the subject had been intrusted, and proceeds to point out his objections to the same. Having given his views against the report, he says on page 53 of his autobiography, Vol. I. of his complete works:

"Such a system of money-arithmetic would be entirely unmanageable for the common purposes of society. I proposed, therefore, instead of this, to adopt the Dollar as our unit of account and payment, and that its divisions and sub-divisions should be in the decimal ratio. I wrote some notes on the subject which I submitted to the consideration of the Financier. I received his answer and adherence to his general system, only agreeing to take for his unit one hundred of those he first proposed, so that a Dollar should be $14\frac{48}{100}$ and a crown 16 units. I replied to this, and printed my notes and reply on a flying sheet, which I put into the hands of the members of Congress for consideration, and the committee agreed to report on my principle. This was adopted the ensuing year, and is the system which now prevails."

In the appendix to his autobiography Jefferson still further explains the silver dollar as our standard of value and unit of account and payment, discusses the amount of pure silver and of alloy it should contain, and points out the proportion which gold should bear to silver,—silver being the standard by which to measure the value of gold, as well as the value of everything else.

The action of the Continental Congress, thus secured by Jefferson, was immediately indorsed under the federal constitution of 1789, and received the full sanction of that instrument. Alexander Hamilton, Washington's first Secretary of the Treasury, universally regarded as one of the greatest financiers in the world's history, fully concurred with Jefferson in regard to the coinage and use of silver money. In a report made to Congress in 1791 Hamilton said:

"To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of the circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation."

Washington, in the abundance of his wisdom, gave his strong approval to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and the giant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellects of such men as Madison and John Marshall failed to discover that such legislation was either dangerous or reckless. And then from the beginning of the republic, onward in its marvellous career of development and glory, the dollar of the fathers and of the constitution for eighty-four years rendered its constant and indispensable aid to the trade, commerce, and prosperity of the American people. In peace and in war it was honorable par-money, and often higher than par with gold, in all the gigantic and widespread transactions of American progress and expansion. For more than three-quarters of the most enlightened and progressive century in human history the silver dollar was the honored and unquestioned currency of the United States Government. At the most critical and crucial periods of that government's existence it was far more relied upon than gold. The war of 1812, the war with Mexico, and the war for the Union were more indebted for their success to silver money, both as a circulating medium and as a metallic basis for the support of a paper currency, than to gold. The gold of the country in times of peril lies hidden away for speculative purposes, while silver remains with the masses and bears the brunt of active use. It is especially endeared to the pioneers and settlers of the new States, admitted into the Union after the adoption of the constitution, and to their descendants who have witnessed its blessings.

With silver money the vast farming regions of the United States have been bought and paid for, and the homes of millions, and of hundreds of millions yet to come, secured and improved wholly by its use. In all those mighty agricultural belts lying in the embrace of the Mississippi and its tremendous tributaries, it has been known and proudly designated as "land-office money." Up the gradual and fertile slopes of the Rocky Mountains, onward through their deep-cleft cañons, over their ranges of perpetual snow, and down on the other side through lands of fabulous wealth and tropical beauty, to the peaceful waters of the Pacific Ocean, the silver dollar has been the active, ever-present money of advancing civilization, the foremost financial missionary in the conversion of the wilderness and waste places into smiling abodes of human happiness. Silver money is the busy, efficient agent of the laboring millions of the world in their daily and hourly transactions involving small sums, while the functions of gold are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mainly adapted to the use of great operators, the wealthy but powerful few. Hence at every stage of American industrial development, the farmer, the mechanic, the wage-worker, and all the sons and daughters of toil, working their way across the continent, conquering its plains for the husbandman, building cities of commerce by its lakes and rivers, and interlacing it from ocean to ocean with vast thoroughfares of iron, steel, and steam, have never doubted the dollar of their fathers, and have only wished it more plentiful in exchange for their daily labor.

By whom, then, and for what reason, has silver money, with such a record for usefulness and integrity, been assailed for destruction? The charge that it is, or ever has been, dishonest money can come only from dishonest sources. The statement that the legal-tender silver dollar ever cheated the laborer is simply a self-evident falsehood. Those who speak of it as a debased currency only debase themselves by first slandering what their selfish interests and knavish avarice impel them to destroy. Even now, after eighteen years of assault and defamation, crippled and discredited as silver money has been by the legislation of 1873, the world bears witness every day that its purchasing power is as great as that of gold, and that it will purchase the gold itself, dollar for dollar, whenever such a transaction is desirable.

It may be stated, therefore, without the slightest fear of contradiction that the attack upon silver money in this and other countries is based upon no demerit or unsoundness on its part, but is simply a movement for the contraction of the currency to the extent of more than one-half the precious metals now in existence. This movement is made by the moneyed classes who wish to increase the purchasing and interest-gathering power of money in their own hands by making it scarce in the hands of others; by people with large incomes growing out of monopolies protected by unjust legislation; by those who enjoy annuities, interest on public securities, fixed salaries under great corporations, and by the creditor classes in general, including all the enormous loan associations, who join in the movement of silver destruction and financial contraction in order to enchance two-fold, and more, the value and power of the money they wring from the hands of the laboring people. There is a power in this movement of financial contraction, if successful, which will result in the practical enslavement of those who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are in debt and who toil for a living. The power of money to govern countries and to enslave people is always to be found where money is concentrated in the hands of the privileged few, while to the great body of the people, the laboring multitudes, is left but a meagre, scant, and stinted circulation with which to supply their wants and meet the exactions laid upon them. The policy of contraction is the policy of organized, unsparing, pitiless avarice, and in its rage to diminish the amount of money in the hands of the people, one branch of the currency is no more secure from assault than another. The establishment of a plutocracy, which is defined as the "paramount influence of wealth, the rule or supremacy of the rich," is the sole aim and end in view, and neither is the best-secured, best debt-paying, legal-tender, par-circulating paper money in the world, nor gold itself, if found to stand in the way of contraction, any safer than silver from attack by the enemies of a full circulation and good prices for labor and property.

Gladstone, in pointing out the dangers which beset England, says: "We are in danger of engendering both a gerontocracy and a plutocracy." A gerontocracy signifies the rule of old families—a danger not yet imminent in this country; but a far greater evil is at our doors. The power of money, pure and simple, in the hands of a very small percentage of our population, who are without ability except in money-getting, and without honorable service to their country in war or in peace, now rules the councils of this government, and casts its threatening and baleful shadow over the present and the future of the American people.

In arriving at a conclusion as to the true motives which inspire the movement for the demonetization of silver, the history of the production of the precious metals and the effect of new mines and increased supplies become of great interest and importance. When gold was found in large quantities in California and Australia, a panic ensued among the creditor and fixed-income classes throughout the world, for fear the amount of gold then in use would be so increased as to weaken its purchasing power, and make it too easily attainable by the producing classes in exchange for their commodities.

He who examines the current history of the times forty years ago will find that upon the discovery of the new gold-fields of that period an excited and alarmed discussion sprang up in regard to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the threatened evils of a gold-inflation produced by an over-abundant supply of that particular metal. Many writers throughout Europe and in this country engaged their talents on the subject. They regarded the expansion of the currency by the new streams of gold pouring into it as a frightful calamity, and raised their vehement and doleful protests against it.

Many authors might be cited, and numerous extracts given, all evincing the same hostility to gold because of the quantity, not the quality, of the money it was likely to afford. So great, in fact, was the alarm created that gold was actually demonetized in Austria and in most of the German states within a period of seven or eight years after California and Australia commenced pouring their treasures into the channels of trade and commerce. This action was reversed, and silver was selected as the victim for demonetization, only when the discovery of silver in such mighty deposits as the Comstock Lode and in other great mines seemed to threaten a greater increase in silver than in gold.

In a speech of very great ability and research delivered in the Senate on the 12th and 13th days of May, 1890, Senator Jones, of Nevada, made the following statement :

"But as soon as the discoveries of gold were made in the alluvial deposits of California and Australia, or, rather, as soon as it was suspected that money would thereby become considerably increased in volume, the annuitants and income classes, the creditors everywhere, took steps to avert what they characterized as a great calamity. They openly declared their purpose, by every means in their power, to prevent a decline in the value of money, so that the purchasing power of their incomes might not be reduced. They determined to go to any length in order to prevent the rise of prices which their aggressive instincts led them to fear would follow the addition to the money volume of the world by the natural and much-needed yield of the mines. The fiat therefore went forth that one of the metals must be discarded. If anything were needed to demonstrate that the reason for the demonetization of silver was the cupidity of the creditor classes, the money-lenders, annuitants, and those in receipt of fixed incomes, and that it was not any defect inhering in the metal silver, nor any change in its adaptability to subserve the purposes of money, it is found in the significant fact that the metal first selected for demonetization was not silver, but gold—that metal which has since become the idol of the money-changers, and which is now declared to be the only natural money. The openly-avowed determination was to increase the power of money, and in order to accomplish that purpose the metal which promised the largest yield was to be condemned and stripped of its ancient monetary function. So strongly was this determination set forth, so earnestly was it presented, and so urgently pressed on the ground of duty, that its achievement came to be regarded as the fulfilment of a high moral purpose,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is constantly insisted, however, that the coinage and use of silver money will drive gold out of the country which adopts both metals. The facts of history not only refute such a statement, but place it beyond discussion and reduce it to contempt. The dismal prediction of gold-exportation from our shores was repeated a thousand times on the floors of both branches of Congress when silver was restored to coinage in 1878, and the raven-croak of coming disaster was taken up and echoed all over the land by the subsidized agencies of the monometallists, the money power, the plutocracy. It is enough to say on this point that, while there were $230,000,000 of gold in this country in 1878, there are about $700,000,000 now. Instead of being forced abroad by the exigencies of trade, gold has remained at home and multiplied itself more than three-fold. This stupendous fact would of itself crush the movement for the destruction of silver were it not that insatiate avarice is deaf to reason and blind to truth. The spirit of Mammon, the lowest of the fallen angels, can never die, but lives on forever, spanning the eternities with falsehood, fraud, and false pretence, for the oppression of the toiling multitudes of the human race.

Let France be cited in proof of the fraternal relations with which gold and silver, when equally honored, move along *pari passu* in the affairs of a government, whether in prosperity or adversity, in sunshine or in storm. The government of France since 1803, whether under the Napoleons or the Bourbons, or emerging from the rags and shackles of monarchy into the glorious garb of a republic, has never discriminated between the free and unlimited coinage of the two metals, and her financial record, tried by the hardest tests, is without a parallel amongst the nations of the earth. No other people on the globe could have furnished forth without panic, bank failures, and widespread financial disaster, one thousand millions of dollars ($1,000,000,000) in gold on the sudden demand of their conquerors, to be drawn at once in bulk by loaded trains and army wagons from their country. Through this terrible ordeal the government of France, without sigh or groan of financial distress, passed at the close of the Franco-Prussian War. Her people, full of employment at fair prices, with a circulating medium three times as large per capita as their European neighbors, or as our own, have remained contentedly at home. Emigration from France is unknown,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while every port on our shores is crowded from day to day and from year to year by German laborers, the very bone and sinew of their fatherland, fleeing from the oppression and impoverishment inflicted upon Germany by the demonetization of silver and the meagre amount of money left in circulation. In a recent speech made by Joseph F. Johnston, president of the Alabama National Bank at Birmingham, the following very striking and instructive passage occurs :

"Can we not follow in the steps of the great republic of Europe? No country on the face of the earth has such a financial record as France; in an incredibly short period of time she not only recovered from the enormous losses of war, and the heavy exactions of a victorious enemy, but was able to come to the relief of imperial England and save her from destruction, when her financial system was tottering, and the monetary repose of the world threatened by the fall of the Barings.

"If, at that time, she had had only one hundred millions of silver, instead of seven hundred millions, what destruction would have followed that financial earthquake! The broken wrecks would have been found on every beach, and desolation and distress would have swept over the civilized world. . . .

"If all the silver produced in the world, less that used in the arts, was coined into dollars by the government of the United States, it would require the world's product for nearly ten years to give us the per-capita circulation of silver that France now has."

But the opponents of silver in the United States point to Great Britain as an example for the American people to follow. A more unfortunate reference could not be made in support of the demonetization of silver. The British Government is based upon an aristocracy of wealth and pauperized labor to an extent hitherto unknown since the downfall of corrupt, imperial Rome. Her policy has not only placed her as the leading creditor nation of the earth, but in the midst of her own people she has made distinctions so deep and broad that the very few own everything, and their established incomes swallow up the proceeds of every toiling hand in the United Kingdom. The oppression of the British laborer arises not from free trade, which is, in fact, the chief wisdom of that government, and of all other governments in a condition to adopt it, but from a stringent contraction of the amount of money in circulation, and the consequent increase of the purchasing power of money in exchange for labor and for what labor produces.

A glance at the creditor and income classes, on the one hand, and the toiling multitudes, on the other, throughout Great Britain,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is appalling. According to reliable official statements, the population of the United Kingdom, embracing England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, may be put down at 28,000,000, and her lands at 72,119,962 acres. Of these lands 51,885,148 acres, more than two-thirds of the whole landed property of the kingdom, are owned by less than 11,000 persons. These vast land-owners draw a rental from an oppressed tenantry of over $562,000,000 per annum, and as the amount of money circulating in the kingdom is contracted, and its volume diminished, so is the purchasing and governing power of these enormous millions increased, and the privileged few aggrandized by grinding the faces of the poor. The foreign policy of England is often denounced for its brutal rapacity, but her home policy, whereby an idle, sensual, income-devouring aristocracy enjoys full and free license to prey upon her toiling masses, wears a darker hue than even the perfidious and crimson stains she has left on distant shores, and with which she has incarnadined the seas. The demonetization of silver is simply in accord with her general system of wealth-aggrandizement and labor-oppression, and is driving her laboring subjects from her shores in numbers equal to great armies every year.

Let those who ape the British system of finances look steadfastly at the horrible results which have followed its adoption and enforcement at home. It is there, as it is here, a concoction of educated, sleepless, ruthless avarice for the purpose of making a shrinkage in all values except the value of money due to the monopolists of wealth; for the purpose of cheapening the wages of every day-laborer and the price of everything which labor has to sell. Such a system of government is fraught with far greater calamities to the great body of the people than the visitations of war or the scourge of pestilence. Falling prices, low rates for labor, and business stagnation, consequent upon scarcity of money among the people, constitute the sources of all the evils which ever afflicted civilized man.

Political organizations may be disturbed by differences of opinion in their ranks, and may sometimes dodge and evade this great question as far as possible; but the American people are growing more enlightened every day, and in the very near future they will reëstablish the policy of Jefferson and the fathers, and restore to themselves the natural and unrestricted use of silver money. The free and unlimited coinage of silver will stand as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an issue in the elections of this and approaching years until its complete triumph. No one, at least in the Democratic party, will seek to obscure or subordinate other great issues, such as Tariff Reform, the Force Bill, and the prevailing profligacy in the expenditure of public moneys, but, at the same time, no one need expect the silver issue itself to be ignored, or to lose its vital importance in the consideration of the people or in the councils of the government.

D. W. VOORHEES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE FRENCH NOVELS FAITHFUL TO LIFE?

BY MADAME ADAM.

THE question I am requested to answer is: "Does the French novel picture faithfully the life and customs of France?"

I reply without paraphrasing, "No, the French novel does not picture the life and customs of France"; and I hope to prove it to the readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in these few pages.

The first obstacle that prevents our novels from presenting the life and customs of our country in their entirety—and if there are exceptions, they only prove the rule—is that they are all written in Paris, edited in Paris, read in Paris, criticised and classed according to their value at Paris, and that they can attain success only in Paris itself. Literature copies its centralizing tendencies from the system of centralization in politics. But it oversteps and exaggerates the latter; for the political representative elected from any one of the four corners of France comes to the capital with ideas and character already formed and definitely moulded by his local surroundings. He is always in touch with his constituents; he returns to them several times a year; has interests in the province; a family there; keeps his local feeling, and generally has a higher position there than the one he occupies at the Palais Bourbon. Doubtless after their arrival in Paris and several years' sojourn there, these deputies and senators alike, whose work and whose mission are in attending to the rural and provincial politics, do come under the influence of the centralizing tendency of Paris to some extent; but they do not allow it to possess them and dominate over them as the young *littérateurs* do. If our novels were written at Marseilles, at Lyons, at Rouen, or at Lille, our novelists would be much better armed against injurious contagion; they would the more easily defend themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from what doctors call morbid affections, and they would escape the dangers that come from the concentration of intellectual vitality that soon overheats itself—a concentration that is filled with injurious principles. The crowding of different organisms, whatever they may be, cerebral or otherwise, which hinders the free play of development, is contrary to the laws which regulate life in general and to the law of circulation which prescribes certain rules under pain of great disturbance.

When any one discusses the question of the decentralization of the arts in France, they tell him that for the most part our novelists are born in the provinces, and that consequently, having been brought up there, they ought to know the country and how to describe it. But that requires examination. Take one of our young novelists who has talent and possesses the qualities of a great man. It will be granted me that I have known, entertained, and counselled several of them. He is born in some province, if you will, but his childhood is passed under the walls of some college, or in a family that is well educated, where he sees only his parents and an occasional friend and comrade. If he has been a laborer all through his youth or has been absorbed in his studies, where would he find leisure for observation? Some things have from time to time struck him because of peculiarities in them, particularly from a ridiculous side. Having at last graduated, the ambition presses upon him to leave his village or small town; for he seems to store up only grievances against the life of mediocrity about him and wishes to fly from what "stifles his faculties," according to the time-honored phrase—narrow, vulgar mediocrity, he repeats, and sees but one side of it. Only half-conscious of the deception of his feelings, for his longing is blind and passionate, he encourages himself to take the step that is to make him an exile, that will transplant him from his native soil; but he considers it a deliverance and a liberation. This corner of the world where he first saw day, so dear to so many Frenchmen, has become a horror to him, and gradually he has grown to look upon what should naturally be his friend as an enemy.

No, he can no longer live in the country; better die of hunger or of other miseries. He must go away where tradition says that thought is untramelled and the horizon broad; in fact, he must go to the great, the only Paris.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am speaking of a talented novelist; not of one of those unfortunate beings who believe they are writers of ability when they are really not so, and who go, poor moths! only to be burned in the blaze of Paris. The young and talented novelist brings a form and a style with him to Paris that he has acquired in this much-scorned country, and these are and will be the groundwork of his future fame. From the time of his arrival in Paris he looks out for a new subject. That is the great watchword, the one important thing—something new; that is, a situation for a romance, a subject that has not yet been treated, or not recently, by a well-known novelist. Even if, for want of something better, he consents to take his heroes from the midst of the province he has so ungraciously abandoned, he will describe the spot where he ignores or denies the existence of any virtues or nobleness, any devotion or, however much concealed, any possibility of happiness, security, perseverance, or any silent grandeur; where everything in the life of the place radiates inward, where the people lead pure lives among themselves, and where so few things draw them to the outer world. But to give a true picture of humanity there and of the scenes of provincial life he must have first loved it himself, must have felt the passions, the cares, the illusions, the surprises, and the joys of it all. Then he would be understood and would understand the others, whereas in reality he is more of a stranger there than a tourist who stops to take a look at the place as he passes through.

If a Parisian author comes back to the country in the vicinity of his native place, it is not to lend an ear to the sweet eloquence of comparisons between this spot and the great city, but to listen as he passes along to the ill feeling among the people, to the recital of some who retail scandal to the Parisian traveller, never failing to add, "It is a true story." And this distortion of a story bears the same relation to them that an actual novel does to the world. Both seek unusual facts, not the general life or an analysis of the existence of the majority of the peasants, workmen, citizens, and people of the middle classes.

The place is so completely composed of one party, the sentiments are so unanimous, that our novelist thinks only of representing the Parisian world composed of more than 50,000 persons separated into nobility, upper-middle class, scientists, artists, politicians, and all those who belong to any of the classes that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have become so dear to the writers of our time. And then at certain epochs men of letters, as well as statesmen, have been astonished by some great change of opinion which in a day jumps from one class of literature to another so completely that one group of writers finds itself speaking falsehoods. It is the country which has refused to let itself be led away by a fashion it has wearied of, or which has become irritated at being abused by hollow words.

French writers for the most part depict nature marvellously well, because it is only necessary to examine nature carefully with an artist's eye to fix the picture and its objects in the mind. Immovable in itself, it finds variety in art. Then, too, no one of our writers describes or judges a landscape in the same way, and all men of imagination—that is, descriptive writers—might pass by the same spot at the same moment and they would paint it in different tints and conceptions, in different styles, and from different points of mental view. French writers have this faculty to a remarkable degree. Never have they understood their work better. Never have they applied the experience and the methods of their old masters to better purpose; but their pictures of life in France and of the customs of the country are so often false, incomplete, untrue, that a stranger cannot, by eliminating, form, as we can, a true estimate of the state of our morality, our family tastes, our motives to action, our sentiments, beliefs, hatred of evil, and efforts toward good.

The novelist I speak of knows no more than Paris,—the true Paris,—since he does not even know his native province. He only remains there until he has created a sort of relationship with the people, wholly external, however—external appearances put on for the benefit of the stranger who is amusing himself there. He sees vice which is displayed because it is merchandise and which passes and repasses before him until it has harpooned its victim. Then he takes this vice for his subject. He writes books with the magic of a style which makes his reputation and purifies it by the absolution of art. Later on, perceiving the insufficiency of his material, and better initiated into the life of what is called the *bout Paris*, he sees what comes to the surface at the capital. When he becomes part of this, he believes that his field for observation is secured for all time in its greater breadth; whereas, in reality, this field does not surpass, either for physical or psychological

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

observation, the ones he might have studied just as well at Rheims, at Angers, or at Toulouse.

The complexity—and the love for it—of exceptional phenomena and of anomalies, which reigns master in Parisian society, to which must be added the fear of falling into weariness, and finally the passion for turning everything to amusement, soon takes possession of a writer who has no compass to guide him and no principles founded on classic examples to prevent him from going astray. He becomes incapable of searching out and discovering the simple truth. He is forever liable to unhealthy influences—to the influence of the exceptional in life. His readers, created by himself, follow him and exact from him something they have not read already, and their favorite has no choice but to find it in the untruthful and the inadmissible.

Able writers in France are making more and more use of form, as time goes on, the lower they fall towards mediocrity of subject-matter. They are becoming more artistic, as singers do whose vocal organs are beginning to decay, but they wander hopelessly away from the true conception of the common things of common life. A novelist describes transitory customs, various individuals of mixed origin, unbalanced natures, people of no class, strangers, men who have suddenly become rich, upstarts, and vainglorious and showy characters. But he gives no idea whatsoever of the life and manners of the two million Parisians about him. If, like M. Zola, he stoops to write of the very bottom of the city, he will go too low, and, like him, will produce something abnormal. The Parisian laborer could not be recognized in these sketches. I have many times talked with the workmen of Paris, and they are scandalized at him ; they detest him, and only become indignant when they read him.

The idealist of the " fourth estate " at the capital finds his literary expression in Victor Hugo or Lamartine, or even in the fantastic pictures of the authors of newspaper stories. Realism and naturalism only keep themselves alive by artificial and restrained observations ; their general truth cannot be imposed upon the people of Paris. The people disdain them ; they are tired of them ; and yet they will give a hundred *pot-bouille* or a hundred *assommoirs* at the theatre for the " Lyons Mail," to witness persecuted innocence—passion rather than open debauchery. My readers will pardon me, I am sure,—and I pray

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them to understand that I have drawn a young novelist at his early work,—that I have made general criticism on a general type rather than on an individual. Had I drawn a single personality, I should have gone contrary to my own method, which is to search for general information instead of isolated facts.

In the early literatures the writer takes for his groundwork his own countrymen. He is necessarily an historian, but he avoids being a chronicler of state documents. He represents an entire race by its primitive qualities, which in turn give its character precisely. Not having any fear that he is going to repeat something already written, with his mind untroubled by situations that have been used before, or by any mine already exploded, he sees the general lines of character, the distinct characteristics of the whole race. These figures have a grand and simple majesty, bound together as they are by the very soul of the people and the race. In fact, all the heroes of these early literatures have in time become traditional types that are forever real.

To-day the closeness of the relations of one with another, the facility of communication for all people, and the constant exchange of literary productions, make the types quite different from those of an earlier date. One scarcely finds the types of the last quarter of a century to-day at all; and yet ought they not to be observed carefully among all this mass, so that their good and bad qualities may be preserved? Character, physiognomy, manners, had changed in France from century to century before the Revolution, and it is just as easy to recognize Frenchmen of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries by their characteristics as it is to recognize an Englishman, an American, or a German. The different occupations, intellectual and physical, put their stamp on men of the same race living at the same time.

Homer in his immortal works has painted for all time the virtuous, patient, faithful wife in Penelope; craft and tenacity of purpose in Ulysses; purely physical courage in Achilles; infidelity and inconstancy in Helen; and the husband deceived but indulgent because of his love in Menelaus. All these figures are true because of the reality and the art in them. Phidias has shown us his method of creating typical beauty by taking from one person a line of the face, and from others a leg, an arm, or the stature. The time was not consumed by him in embarrassing himself with details, nor in giving his work too great a heaviness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He dedicated himself to that which includes in the smallest space the greatest amount of observation.

The later and riper literatures voluntarily abandon the search after general types, because writers imagine that the demand for novelty which their readers have cannot be satisfied with the renewal of characters. They deceive themselves; for this same repetition does satisfy a part of the public curiosity to-day. The types exist always, just as vegetation and growth exist when the material and seed are at hand.

The grand currents of human intelligence run by their constant oscillations from the form to the idea, from the exaltation of the flesh to the most complete spiritualization, and they permit at any time the complete summarizing of the good and bad qualities of a certain number of men and women. A writer will be more certain to interest powerfully those who read him, and that too for all time, if he gives general truths rather than specializations, which go out of fashion like certain clothes. He is certainly more likely to be read a second time.

What made the literary and artistic power of the Greeks—a power that will forever be the highest—is that for the first and only time in human history the Greeks knew how to combine for an instant form and ideal in art by deifying matter and materializing the divine.

In our time Balzac has gone to the extreme of specialization, searching out the individual events even up to the gate of the tribunals, adding to this specializing quality all that his imagination suggested to him, and finally producing characters that have survived because they have a certain amount of reality in them; but at times they contain so little truth that the passionate admirers of the great writer have come to imitate and copy the heroes of Balzac in order to give them a little life. And thus he made his contribution in this manner to the records of the most insincere generation it has been permitted us to examine. Flaubert is, among the other famous writers of modern France, the one who has chosen his types most sincerely by honest observation and by examining ancient and modern peoples; and he has materialized his thoughts most thoroughly in the ideal parts of his characters. Those who write or have written of his time may perhaps be his equals, but no one can surpass him except Victor Hugo, who is more colossal. Bouvard and Pecuchet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will always be a pair of historic characters in the history of our times.

When some one calls to the attention of hardened naturalists the fact that an absolutely unique character can exist, just as monstrosities and material phenomena certainly do, but says that, however true that may be, it is not true in the highest sense of the word, since an absolutely unique character does not necessarily reproduce itself in the same form again, they answer: What exists for this one hour, having, as it does, its place in the general life, can be as justly described and written upon as something that normally reproduces itself. Doubtless; but we have the right to add: In nature the tree torn by a tempest, filth thrown from a house into the street, are an injury to mankind; things that are ugly, distasteful, of bad odor, criminals—all these are the exceptions which nature, society, and mankind drive out, and from which they cleanse themselves. Why should we try to give these by the use of art that which everything unites in denying to them?

The hard-and-fast rules of the naturalists pretend to cover themselves with the comprehensive name of science, and then they proceed to go contrary to its mandates. They never control one fact by another similar to it. They are satisfied to force some fact which they have observed into the same class with others which absolutely contradict it, because of a single demonstration, no matter how irregular it may be. They take possession of some moral or material irregularity, but they add nothing to their supply of scientific observations, and they claim it for themselves not so much from the particular observation as on the ground of truth! The characters of the individuals whom they choose as their heroes must always be followed by an epithet. It is the drunken laborer, the lost woman, the nervous man of the world, etc., etc. A naturalist once said to me: "The ugly thing in them brings their characters out just as hideousness does that of the monster, but beauty in all its forms is always insipid."

Those naturalists of the school of M. Zola make their characters move in the midst of scenes which they describe with an amount of detail that conceals the absence of truth still more. The superficial reader says to himself: "Oh, can this be so? I almost believe I can breathe the bad air of the stairway which he describes; there are, indeed, such objects in a bedchamber, in a kitchen, in a linen-room; there are just such thistles in the field

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or near the rocks, and such uncleanliness in a corner of the farm. Labor and the sun make men sweat; and why should not the characters described here be as real as everything else?"

The idealists put their characters in an atmosphere of idealized nature, on a background slightly blurred and in an irregular frame, so as to give more relief to the figures they paint. Exaggerating them continually, they give them too much character. They believe in the sacredness of art. They can describe what is odious, criminal, and tragic; never the indelicate. Low passions, disgusting details, as a rule, never attract people. When they meet something of the sort in their path, they turn aside and try to avoid it. Why put it in a book under the noses of readers? Where there are exceptions by the way, disgusting features of life, there is not the proper way, nor the proper life.

Few among the generality of mankind look for the repulsive or wallow in vice. Wickedness and ugliness, if they were produced in equal quantities with beauty and virtue, would long ago have overrun humanity and society. Dr. Sombroso, in his learned studies, shows us the cause of crime and of animal tastes, but by this he proves that it is not the law of our being. Nature, like man, and in general like society, fights against corruption, which she covers with the veil of vegetation, as art should cover with its veil the monstrosities of society. Indeed, it has been established that these monstrosities would occur less frequently if they were not—so to speak—given as an example to those who have an instinct towards evil. How can a novelist who is of the naturalistic school, who is the painter of existing customs as the historian is of past events and the learned scholar of eternal events—how can he choose only that which nature teaches him is transient, especially when she tries to bury it or transform the filth?

The idealists, too, are not always free from the reproach of searching for exceptions in their characters, and they often injure their demonstration by giving the naturalist the opportunity of saying: "That is not true." I repeat, the type is rarely sought, since it is more difficult to find than the individual. A picture from nature is necessarily easy to paint, since the composition employed in making a bit of nature complete is of a very high order—requires genius, in fact, and that is supplied by nature herself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Naturalism—that is to say, the brutal use of ugliness in all its forms, the excessive centralization of literature which collects all French writers in Paris within a narrow field of observation—has created a profane class of talented authors,—one cannot speak of a *sacred* class in designating naturalism,—who have made themselves echoes of each other and have infested journalism with their coterie. Not having anything to oppose them except powers like those of Victor Hugo and Flaubert, they have drowned, so far as the general public is concerned, the voice of writers of another sort of ability who still remain faithful to their pen and their art. Some of our old masters still living have sacrificed to the golden calf and called the schism just, but a great current is gradually, little by little, setting aside the literature of the mire, of vice, of drunkenness, of debauchery, and of all that is ignoble. Things that are neither vile nor tainted are beginning to please; better still, by an implacable logic idealism made repulsive in man by the naturalists is being sought now in nature by the symbolists to a great extent. Before long young writers will turn towards those qualities and passions that really exist among their French brothers, laborers, middle class, nobles, artists; and, instead of exciting the different classes to hold each other in contempt, they will cause them to take the trouble to know and esteem each other so that they may help one another socially, if need be, and that abroad one may judge us at last as we are.

"Misfortune to the vanquished" is a terribly true motto. The conquered often add defeat to defeat; and that is what we have done by a certain phase of literature, the most brilliant of our arts since 1870. To-day fortified, thinking of a gradual but necessary decentralization, having regained a consciousness of our material and intellectual resources, we are forcing our novelists to raise us in art as we have raised ourselves in national and international politics. Literature has not escaped the great popular inspiration. After having been put in a degraded position by fashion, it will glorify honor and heroism, and it will represent far more truly after this, if not our character, at least our truest private and public aspirations.

JULIETTE ADAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LACK OF GOOD SERVANTS

BY MRS. M. E. W. SHERWOOD.

THIS is getting to be a very important and curious question—one of the few that does not right itself. In more than one prosperous village of New England, through central New York and Pennsylvania,—probably the geographical limits could be stretched further,—families are disbanding, going to hotels for their dinners, living in anybody's house but their own, in lack of a servant or servants. These well-to-do people are willing to pay good wages and give their servants every comfort, but a maid who can cook and wash and iron is becoming a greater luxury than a powdered footman in London. A person who can and will work with her hands has become the lawgiver to those who cannot. Where is that class whom, with a fine irony, we call "Help"?

It is a perilous state of things, and not to be endured, when a well-to-do lady, in a prosperous town, has to stay at home from church all through the summer because she cannot find a nurse to care for the baby, and because no maid can be hired for love or money. These people are perfectly willing to pay good wages, to lodge and feed their servants well; but although the cities are full of starving, able-bodied people, the deadlock continues. It is a mysterious and inexplicable problem, more to be wondered at than the occasional and inevitable panic, worse than the strikes, because it lasts all the year round, and impossible, from the point of view of the starving, who would, one would think, rather become domestic servants than starve.

The Swedes make the best servants of all our imported working people, and the reason of it was gravely stated to me by a Swedish cook (who had herself risen to be the mistress of servants, and who deeply deplored the idleness and the disobe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dience which, she said, were creeping in even amongst them in our American life) to be the old Swedish custom of "Husalga,"—an old Swedish law by which the masters are still empowered to inflict corporal punishment on their servants, male and female. "Ah!" said Freuda, "that made good servants!" So would have argued the housekeepers of the South; and, no doubt, in a kindly and well-ordered Southern family fifty years ago there were the best of all servants. Authority, not brutality, authority enforced by law, is necessary to the proper conduct of a kitchen, as of a state. Employers should be bound to the rules of justice and humanity, and should have neither right nor power to require from their servants what is unjust or inhuman; also the duties of servants should be clearly defined, reasonable, and fixed. The mistress should have her rights as well as the servant. Once hired and taken into the house, the mistress is legally entitled to the servant's time and service, and the servant should stay out the number of weeks or months for which she has contracted. But in the United States a maid may go at any moment; she follows her caprice; may leave the dinner half cooked and the baby crying in the cradle. The mistress must pay her and let her go.

Of course this terrible condition of inequality cannot exist forever. The American mind is fertile of expedients, and will in time educate both mistresses and maids in their respective duties. It is quite impossible that the affairs of a household can be administered with prosperity and comfort if the mistress does not know what ought to be done and if the servant does not know how to do it. It has been the confusion of the American experiment—this taking of the Irish peasant, the peasant from the fields of Europe, into the small, well-regulated, private family; to expect a creature with no training at all to cook, wash, and iron, sweep, dust, and to take care of children—that most delicate of all industries—acceptably. Her own home has certainly not been a superior establishment for the formation and development of high industrial and domestic qualities. A woman goes out to service as into a new existence. Dress and language are unfamiliar. Her very shoes and stockings are, to her, new and inconvenient appendages. The furniture, food, employment, are as different to her as is the cabin of the Irishman from the palace of the peer. An American kitchen, with its neat cooking-stove and its mechanical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aids to facilitate labor (so easy a book to read for the well-educated wife of an American mechanic), is to the foreign servant a thing as different from her first impressions, associations, and habits as the speaking of Chinese would be to her mistress, were she to be suddenly invited to a tea party in Hong Kong. No doubt both mistress and maid are mutually disgusted and displeased, and the maid takes leave: the mistress is very grateful if she takes nothing else.

There are women born into this world with a capacity for training servants. To them we owe that large class of really good and efficient women who can be found in large cities, Irish women generally, who have been in the country several years, but who are very much in the minority. Now, the existence of such women suggests the first step toward the remedy. Why should not such women open schools for the domestic and industrial training of servants? I have heard of a few such institutions in different parts of the country; that is a favorable omen, but it does not extend far enough. Why will not ladies take it up, as they have done the training-school for nurses, that industry which has had so tremendous a result in making Mrs. Gamps impossible, and giving to poor humanity that which it so gravely needed—an educated intelligence in the sick-room? These establishments for the training of servants are far too few to be felt and appreciated in their advantages throughout the country at large; but imagine what a splendid opening there is for some hundreds of intelligent women who are now, perhaps, eating their hearts out in some lonely New England homes, wondering what they shall do with their lives, if they would organize a training-school for servants, take the ignorant peasant girl just arrived at the government docks, teach her how to cook, or to sew, or to wash and get up fine linen; make of her a thoroughly good servant, teaching her first a subject on which she is always very ignorant,—moral obligation,—an ignorance fostered by the general condition of the social state. Indeed, the general condition of the social state is answerable for the majority of the evils connected with domestic service. Let them teach her that she should treat the property of her employers as carefully as if it were her own; that, as her employers are obliged to do justly by her, so should she be just to her employers; that she should respect their rights, and defend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, as she hopes that they will respect hers; and inform her that it is a principle lying at the very basis of civilized life that substantial and valuable service will be well paid for always by those for whom the service is rendered. The law of wages is no mere custom or tradition, but the obligation of natural justice and the rights of man. The debt and obligation are not on one side, however,—on neither side exclusively,—but should conjointly rest on both.

The Americans are the only people in the world who pay well for bad cooking and detestable service, grudgingly given, glad in most instances (if rural housekeepers) to "get a girl," no matter how inefficient and disqualified she may be, for the work of the house. She must be fed, clothed, and respected, and her wages paid. She may break crockery to any extent, often to that of thousands of dollars; she may throw away sugar and flour and meat and potatoes by bad cookery; she may be insolent to her mistress, taking her own time for going out day or evening; and she may badly wash the flannels and scorch the gentleman's shirts: the mistress must put up with it, else the precious creature will leave and the lady must do her own work; or, as a dress-maker who had badly cut some gowns for an employer remarked, putting the fragments in at the door: "Here, finish your gowns yourself."

This is not good political economy. The servant should be taught moral obligation. We must remember that there is no tyranny in a republic; there can be none but the tyranny of the masses. And as the welfare of the millions is bound up in this question, as the comfort and prosperity of our great estate must depend on the industrial ability and honesty of those who serve us for wages, it follows that the first thing to teach a servant is a sense of moral obligation. When we take into consideration the early history of those who come to us as domestic servants, the marvel turns out to be, not that they are so deficient, but that they are not more so. Look at the poorer classes in the streets of Glasgow, for instance; we need not cross to the adjacent kingdom; we know all about "the pig and the praties," and really from Pig-and-Pratie-dom came some of the very best of our nurses and maids. No one who has kept house a number of years but has a sprinkling of delicious and refreshing gratitude, in her reminiscences, over some dear and faithful Biddy. Their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faults are those of ignorance and that double brain which is always tripping itself up (the cause of the Irish bull), the impossibility of a clear comprehension of the straight road, blinking, and being blinded by their own wit, and their aimless, inaccurate absence of logic. How much could be done by giving these Norahs the healthy and bracing influence of honest Puritan training in a New England town! We all know what it has done for some of them,—made them perfect servants.

"Yes," the unhappy Massachusetts matron will say, "it has made them too good to work. They will not come, for twelve dollars a month, to cook, wash, and iron, as they used to do; no, and the second girl generally marries her master, if he becomes a widower." Quite so; we have to meet the enervating influence of prosperity and luxury even here. But we should not be dismayed. We must go still further in our educational efforts for servants. The raw material is being dumped at the government docks at the rate of five or six thousand a week, to state it mildly. The great German steamers, those from Rotterdam, those from Havre and from Liverpool, all deposit great quantities of young women, who have come on to make a living, every day in the week. Why should there not be an organized body of respectable women to meet them, to take them into cleanly homes, to train them to become good domestic servants? They would be worth half a dozen Lady Clara Vere de Veres, each one of them—worth forty over-educated, brain-feverish students of the higher education, who can do nothing, either as housekeepers or breadwinners. No sadder story is extant than the story of the fate of those highly-educated daughters of washerwomen who have been over-educated, and who cannot find an honest industry and have been driven to a dishonest one.

Now, let us imagine for a moment a cargo of the London "slaveys" landed on our shores; those who open the doors of London lodging-houses, the Tilly Slowboys of Dickens. Food, that inalienable right of every servant, has been denied them; they have pined for good bread and meat, or have been fed on pernicious diet in the back alley of a London lodging-house. The careless, unfeeling, avaricious employer is well known to us who travel. The kitchen larder would be too heavy an item of expense did the white slave receive sufficient wholesome food. Hard work and late hours have made severe exactions on her health, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perhaps a brother is about to emigrate to America, and the slavey has saved enough to come with him. Hundreds of such girls do come. Perhaps this insufficiency of food has made her dishonest (poor thing! an Arctic voyager will eat anything when he is mad with hunger); she steals a little when she is first taken into an American kitchen, with its liberal supplies. The sense of honor and honesty is deadened in such a creature, of course. But if she were well taught and well trained, and if she learned that honesty were the best policy (having tried both), she might become the most useful, as well as the most trustworthy, of servants.

The business of these noble women who should teach servants should also extend to the mistresses. The duties of servants should be closely defined, reasonable, and fixed. It is astonishing how little friction there is in some families where all this is done by the mistress. She can then hold her domestic distinctly responsible, as a master carpenter can define to his men that such a board must be six inches long and another ten and a half. And to do so, make the servant feel that she has an interest and a stake in the whole body politic; let her position be reasonable, established, and understood, and she will, in nine cases out of ten, do her work willingly and well, and in the shortest space of time.

Regular and sufficient sleep is essential to the health of servants, and here the mistress comes in for her bit of training. The late hours of society and fashion tell heavily on the higher class of fashionable servantdom. Porters, grooms, footmen, coachmen, butlers, housekeepers, cooks, ladies' maids, are all harassed and injured by the turning of day into night and night into day. A thoughtful mistress will see to this, and have her night work done by different relays; and so, in the country, in small households, the nurse who is deprived of her rest must be relieved.

But what to do with the slovenly, unregulated heathens, and what to do without them—that is the question. Can no Baron Rumford arise and do for New York and Boston and Philadelphia and Chicago, for Utica and Cooperstown and Exeter and Manchester, for Worcester and for New Haven, for Hartford and Peoria, what he did for Munich, and bring rich and poor together? Here is, to speak not too figuratively, a large, red-armed, strong German girl on one side of the street, saying, "Give me work or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I perish!" On the other side is the pale wife of the lawyer or doctor or minister, saying, "Send me some help, or I faint"; and the two never come together. Where is the missing link? It is to this end that the strong and willing girl should be found and educated, and sent into the rural districts, that she should be helped to find what would be to her the greatest boon, exactly such a place as the house of a modest yet comfortable family who would be glad of her service for a reasonable wage. That would be the sort of home that a Norwegian, a Swede, a German, a Swiss, or an English girl would be glad to find, one would suppose.

Now, in the cities and amongst opulent people there is the same complaint, usually, of the lack of fidelity to engagements. Here, again, the employers need education. They enter upon the engaging of servants too hastily, and perhaps part with them too inconsiderately. Servants cannot perform impossibilities, nor can they adapt themselves at once to the fresh habits of fresh people. Those who begin by promising everything are generally the first to perform very little, and those who are sufficiently honest for self-assertion are occasionally rejected as inflexible and impertinent. Too much pliancy is inconsistent with the firmness of truth, and the other extreme is apt to be sycophancy and deceit. "Fancy" is, however, an insufficient guide in the hiring of a servant, and therefore we must fall back on the written testimonial and character.

Here, it is to be feared, the best of women are not always true to themselves. It is said that a lady sometimes gives a good character to a bad servant to get rid of her; and yet how difficult it is to write the character of a servant! One wishes to be as kind as the case will allow, and "not stand in the poor girl's way." One reasons thus: What is objected to by one family may not be by another; what one would consider a great fault would be no fault in another; and the unsuitableness of a servant for one place would be fitness for another. Perhaps as a servant leaves us we forget the annoyance she has caused, and only see a poor creature in search of bread and the money to support a poor mother. So the "character paper" has become a rather useless piece of composition. One often takes a cook whose "character" pictures her a *cordon bleu*, and she proves unequal to the roasting of veal. Where, one asks, are these *plats*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which Mrs. Goodhearte so eloquently describes? Where the light bread and the neat kitchen? Not *chez nous*.

On one point ladies should not be dissimulators, either to themselves or to their friends. A drunkard should not be handed along, nor a woman notoriously bad-tempered or unneat. There will be little, if any, marked improvement among our female servants until ladies are more careful about the giving of characters. The great demand for domestic servants teaches them that, if they leave a place on Monday, they can get another before Saturday; and, indeed, many women live that way, getting their whole month's wage many times over, and only doing two or three days' work for it, perhaps intentionally making themselves impossible. In this respect the law should be called in to protect employers, who are at the present moment the most "unprotected females" in the world. Servants should learn that they cannot get good testimonials without having earned them and deserved them; secondly, that they cannot get good places so easily without characters.

It is a thousand pities that servants should be "changed" so frequently. What some one said of a belle, that she changed her mind toward her admirers as often as Mrs. Marchanay changed her servants, will express what one means. A continuance of service is the only thing which can lead to that faithful performance of one's duties which makes the old servant so respectable. How glad one is to see a familiar hospitable door opened by the same man twice or three times! Nowadays, in America, the old family servant, once so useful, so respected, so beloved, is almost a *rara avis*. Servants are becoming a separate community; our enemies, rather than our humble friends; a lava-bed beneath our feet, full of danger and pitfalls and hidden honeycombing. They have little or nothing in common with the families with whom they live. Their joys and sorrows, their employments in their spare time, their pursuits, aims, and friendships, are all alien to those of the family whose roof shelters them. Were it not for the blessed interposition of children, there would be no chord of attachment, no bond of union, between the family and those who serve them. The latter are unknown strangers for everything except work and duty. Is it, therefore, to be wondered at that they are faithless? We treat dogs and horses much more reasonably; we make them love us, we feed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, we bespeak them gently, we praise and we notice them. Surely, in the practical working of domestic life, there should be more mutual good will.

Let no mistress be afraid that she may break down her authority or make herself common, or would be likely to evoke a response of impertinence, by being kind to her servants. It is not kindness, but an injudicious use of kindness, which makes anybody rude who ought to be respectful and deferentially civil and grateful. A kind mistress finds a safe and a royal way to the hearts of her servants, by taking an interest in their health, their pursuits, even their tastes. They grow to love her and to kiss the hem of her garments, if they see that she is thinking of them as being human. If she is grateful for an unexpected service, she need indulge in no undignified familiarity. Indeed, they will respect her the more if she is stern with them, so far as her duty requires her to be; but if she is sympathetic, her gentle and intelligent manner of being firm will correct the flippancies of a careless and ignorant servant; it will put a heart into the faithful blunderer who would "like to please." The mistress will not receive an eye-service, a perfunctory service, a mechanical service, but a real service.

As for the accomplished servants, none equal the French as cooks, waiters, laundresses, and ladies' maids; they are peerless, and it is ever an experiment worthy of trial—the employment of the humbler and comparatively untaught rural French as household servants. The Parisians soon get haughty and disdainful, and throw us over as being unworthy of their steel. Even if we do not, being the worm, turn, when too much trodden on, and send them back to their native shores at our own expense, regarding ourselves as worthy to avenge their steel, or steal, they are great rascals sometimes, particularly the *chefs*. Others are perfectly trustworthy, and as for manners they are almost as agreeable as negroes; which was once saying a great deal. It is to be feared that "freedom from her mountain height" has screeched rather too loudly, and has half impaired that nameless grace which once hung about the delightful old negress in her colored turban, who loved the young "Mars" so well and to her death served her "Mess Maria." One might go into the subject of the ballot, and whether it has been a boon to the negro. One could write an essay on the manners of the colored coachmen and waiters at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington; but there are some epics which are more eloquent unwritten, perhaps.

The story of the unfaithful servant is as old as human history, and we have not yet reached the Molière period, when the valet comes into comedy as the most important functionary on the dramatic side of life. The servant is disappearing. In our history there is a fear of his becoming extinct—a species of dodo. It is not the question of his non-ability, but of his nonentity, that troubles us. He is not there; his undusted chair awaits him. It is the curious lack of sequence which troubles us. Why, then, is it that the mistress stands on one side of the street and the maid on the other awaiting the signal? The one beckons; the other does not see. Who will find the open sesame, the talismanic word? Where are they, faithful or unfaithful? Are they to be found on the docks?

The first impediment in the way of the lady philanthropist will be to meet and forestall the rush which is made for all available female help by the intelligence-office men, who seize these newly-arrived immigrants for the great hotels and summer watering-places. A landlord of one of the largest of these says that he takes these girls, not asking for characters, and makes them work under a grim housekeeper, only anxious that they should be neat about the tables and bedrooms, and leaving it to their own sense of propriety to dress themselves becomingly. As for lovers, and their amusements after their work is done, he asks no questions. This cannot be a very good school for domestic servants, and very few ladies will take a domestic who has only this background. I happened to talk with a pleasant-faced Norwegian girl at a Western hotel last winter who was a chambermaid, and she deplored this state of things. She said that her countrywomen would like permanent homes, but that the money to be earned in hotels was much greater. They could retire sooner, and get married, or return to Norway. She said the life in hotels was very hard, especially as many girls are put to sleep in one large room, coming in at all hours of the night, chattering and singing, and keeping those awake who desired a quiet night's rest. She declared herself quite anxious to go to some retired spot where she could live in a family, but she said no one would take her with only a hotel recommendation.

There is such a prejudice in the American mind against house-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold service that I wish there could be a medal offered by the State—a sort of *rosière* business, a flitch-of-bacon reward, or some of the old feudal customs revived—to reward the successful competitor for the power to be a good kitchen maid. It should be made an order of nobility, and then we might have some hope that our rural gentry could be served well in their own houses, as their fathers and mothers have been.

It is instructive to read in this connection an admirable paper by the clever writer, Katherine Pearson Woods, on the "Queens of the Shop, the Workroom, and the Tenement," to learn what painful and really unnecessary sufferings a woman will undergo rather than to take the comforts of a place in a respectable family, where she would be fed and warmed and cared for, well paid, if only she would accept the profession of domestic service, "honorable amongst all men" and historically and poetically noble. Mrs. Woods says: "To enumerate the different trades by which women in New York are endeavoring, not to live,—that for many of them is as utterly unattainable a goal as the end of the rainbow,—but simply to postpone as long as possible their appearance at the morgue or in the cemetery—to attempt to do this would be useless." She goes on to describe the girls who work in soap-factories and whose business it is to wrap the separate cakes, while hot, in paper. The caustic soda used in the manufacture first turns their nails yellow, then eats away the ends of their fingers. There seems no way to help this, as the deftness of touch required would be, of course, impossible if the worker wore gloves. It is, indeed, only possible to a given set of workers for a very short time, but there are always plenty to take their places when they drop out! What becomes of these poor mutilated creatures no one asks.

But might it not be possible to save them from this terrible doom, if we had training-schools for servants, as for nurses, where they could be supported while learning their trade, and apprenticed for five years after? Could we not find capitalists in great rich America who would endow such schools, far more needed than public libraries or Cornell University, where the great lack of domestic service could be filled, and girls saved from the making of arsenical artificial flowers, poisonous dyed feathers, the nicotine paralysis, and the soap cakes? Must we continue to have the "Song of the Shirt," and the "Sweater"? As Mrs. Woods says

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the end of a most impressive article, "God help us all, unless we change this state of things."

I asked my Norwegian friend why the girls coming from the lonely pastures of her native land were so anxious to avoid the country and to herd together in cities. "Oh!" said she, "it saves the homesickness." Perhaps there is a great truth hidden here, which the philanthropic men of America would do well to study. It might be a part of the training-school to find out how to enliven these lonely lives, so that the great rush for the overcrowded town, with its dismal tragedies, could be avoided. It is worth consideration, and I cannot but hope that some Mrs. Fry, Mrs. Howard, Florence Nightingale, or Louisa Lee Schuyler may take it up.

"I need the counsel of thy larger thought." I have seen in the course of years, during which time I have employed many servants, the great need of instruction, and how grateful a girl is to be taught. Any lady who knows a little about cooking can by patience make a fairly good cook out of very raw material in a few months. The influence of a refined household tells on the almost savage nature in a short time. The worst of this is that the accomplished servant will leave her patient instructor, and go off to "fresh woods and pastures new" and to higher wages, and here is the first duty of the philanthropic schoolteacher; the servant must be taught the moral obligation to stay where she is wanted.

We can never have the "perfect service" in a republic, but we can do a great deal better than we are doing. We can take a lesson from the founders of the constitution, who so well contrived to put it into the head of every American citizen that he was the most important brick in the building, and that on him must all depend, that most American men work well for themselves, for the State, and for the Union. When we can so educate a trained domestic service that the women employed find that they are doing the best for themselves, as well as for us, in being good cooks and laundresses, good nurses and maids, we shall have solved one of the great problems of the nineteenth century.

This might well become an international question, and kindly women might combine with their English, Norwegian, Swedish sisters as to these girls, who should be sent fresh from their own homes to their American homes. I know all about Miss Emily Faithfull's efforts and her failure, but I think that it was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because she attempted too much, and with too little help on the other side. Now that organizations are so possible and thorough as we see in the woman's temperance societies and in many philanthropic and artistic combinations, why should we not attempt the importation of female servants who, being helped and educated, shall be bound by some contract to stay in their places until their education is paid for—that education not being Shakespeare and the musical glasses, not French or Italian, not the piano (excepting to dust it), but the finer and rarer art of making a house pleasant to live in, of cooking an eatable dinner, of doing the work of a kitchen neatly and well.

M. E. W. SHERWOOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR BUSINESS PROSPECTS.

BY CHARLES STEWART SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

THE extreme money stringency, or panic, so generally anticipated and predicted some months since, has not arrived. Two principal causes have operated to prevent it: first, the business world prepared for it by getting out of debt as rapidly as possible; and, secondly, the enormous crops of all kinds in this country and the certainty of a large European demand for our surplus at good prices have created confidence in the immediate future, which has been reflected in the Wall Street barometer by the recent considerable advance in stocks, which foreign capitalists have quite recently been disposed to buy for "quick turns" on the market, while they avoid permanent investments in good American railroad bonds, with which our bankers and corporations are now burdened because of the distrust prevailing abroad regarding the permanancy of our gold standard.

With assured prosperity in the agricultural interests, a financial panic is impossible in the United States.

Although the late crisis in England, occasioned by the embarrassment of the Barings and over-speculation, was followed in this country by the shipment of seventy millions of gold to Europe, yet it was essentially a private banker's disturbance; and it incidentally, and by reflection only, affected the commercial interests of this country. Still prudent merchants "shortened sail" and waited developments. This caused a serious depression in business for a time, from which it has not yet fully recovered.

The industrial and commercial establishments of this country are to-day upon a sound, conservative basis. There is no inclination towards speculation, and they are more cautious than usual in incurring obligations. Collections have been better than the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

average during the summer, and the demands for money from merchants less than usual.

A glance at the situation of some of our leading industries will confirm the above observation and serve as an illustration of the general condition.

There is a larger aggregation of capital engaged in the production of textile fabrics than in any other manufacturing industry in the United States. We have fifteen and a half millions of cotton-spindles, which, including the complete equipment of the mills, represent, in the competent opinion of Mr. Edward Atkinson, a capital of $232,500,000; and it would be a conservative estimate, based upon the census reports for 1880, to assume that the invested capital of the woollen, silk, and other mixed-textile manufactures, including bleacheries, dye-works, etc., is at present $225,000,000 in addition. The capital employed in the various commission, wholesale, and retail agencies for the sale of textile fabrics would at least equal the amount engaged in manufacturing. We thus arrive at the enormous total of more than $900,000,000 engaged in this industry, with its attendant traffic.

Of carpets we are the largest producers in the world, and in design, colors, and quality our goods are quite equal to anything made in Europe of competing grades; of silk, we exceed in amount the product of England and Germany, and are second only to France; and in plain silks (in which we excel as respects quality and durability) we equal the product of the most famous looms of Lyons.

The large corporations of New England engaged in cotton-manufacture have had, as indicated by their last half-yearly dividends, average success, notwithstanding the fact that the average prices of cotton fabrics for the past six months have been the lowest known in the history of the trade in the United States, even in the times of exceptional temporary panic or depression; the quotations of the stocks of the leading mills are generally above par, and in many cases at a large premium; and for a series of years the return to the investor has been more profitable and steady than the average railroad earnings of this country.

Although an English cotton mill costs to build and equip fully 33⅓ per cent. less than ours, and while labor in such mills is 20 per cent. less in England than here (in some industries the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difference is much greater), it is an interesting fact that one may buy the low and medium grades of cotton goods of the class used by the masses, or a ready-made garment of the same, say of shirtings, calico, gingham, canton flannel, and the like, in the retail stores of New York and Chicago, quite as low as a similar article can be bought in London, Paris, or Berlin. American standard sheetings and drills have the preference in the Chinese market, and are sold in competition with English- and German-made goods, and always at better prices because of their superior quality. The product of favorite brands of American standard sheetings and drills adapted to the China markets have been sold in advance of production for more than six months past, and a prominent mill has now 10,000 packages engaged for the African market.

It is a humiliating fact that every bale of New England-made goods destined for China is shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Vancouver and from thence to its destination by English steamers, and this large traffic has been diverted from the American railways and from the Pacific Mail steamers because that line of steamers has not heretofore been able to compete with the English Government subsidy.

It has been proved that we can successfully compete with Europe in the Oriental markets, in the manufacture and sale of plain cotton goods, when the cost of labor in producing a piece of goods does not exceed 25 per cent. of the total cost. I have seen recently a stylish and appropriate summer morning dress, made from a colored American cotton dress fabric by a young lady with her own fingers, where the cost of the material did not exceed one dollar and a quarter. A ready-made suit of clothes for a man, of common American cassimere, will not cost in New York to-day 15 per cent. more than a similar suit bought in London; and this excess in cost is due to the increased cost of wool here and to the fact that the percentage of labor-cost upon the cassimere is relatively six times as much as on the cotton fabrics above referred to.

It must be admitted that the woollen and worsted industry of this country has been less uniformly successful and has experienced far more fluctuation during the past twenty years than the cotton industry; and this has been due mainly to the tariff and its interpretation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While I yield to no one in the belief that experience, which in the end settles all questions of theory, has demonstrated that a reasonable protective tariff is the true economic policy for the United States, still I am of the opinion, in opposition to our present policy, that a very low tariff upon wool, or free wool, would benefit alike the manufacturer and the wool-grower, and would place both interests upon a firmer basis of prosperity. It would enable the manufacturer to largely increase, as well as diversify, the production; it would create a larger demand for American wools, for mixing with foreign, and increase the price to the farmer.

Except for the general and mistaken prejudice of the wool-grower, to which the law-making power has yielded, there is no more reason, even from the Protectionist's standpoint, why our tariff-makers should place a duty upon the low grades of wool known as carpet wools than upon indigo or any other article not produced in this country.

The growth of the iron industry, notably within the last five years, is simply marvellous. The census of 1880 gives the invested capital of the iron and steel industry as $230,971,884. We are without the figures of the late census, but it is fair to assume, as the production has increased during the last decade two and a half times, that the capital may now be estimated at $450,000,000. The Hon. A. S. Hewitt, than whom there is no better authority, estimates that it requires $1,000 capital for every man employed in the manufacture of iron. Notwithstanding the enormous expansion in this industry, the returns to the manufacturers have been reasonably satisfactory. The group of corporations connected with the name of the distinguished author of the "Gospel of Wealth"* is reported upon trustworthy authority to have been phenomenally prosperous during the year 1890. A prominent iron-manufacturer states:

"We have made more money in our mills in 1890 and 1891 by rigid economy than for several years past, and my experience is presumably not exceptional. There has been no important failure in the iron trade for twelve months past, although the price of iron is very low, lower than for many years. An owner of a mill who is selling iron freely at the lowest price named by any one in this country, informed me that they declared a 9 per cent. dividend last year; it is proper to add, however, that large profits have only been made on the production of specialties covered by patents, and not upon plain staples which are open to general competition."

* Mr. Andrew Carnegie.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The iron trade of the United States has had in the past so many periods of severe depression that manufacturers have been obliged to study all sorts of labor-saving methods in order to decrease the cost of production; there is no other country in the world where so much is accomplished by such devices as in the United States, in all branches of manufacturing—*i. e.*, more labor per man is performed in the United States than elsewhere. While the iron industry has felt more severely the depression of last spring and the fall in prices than most other trades, because of the almost total cessation of railroad construction and extension, still the outlook is encouraging. Iron and steel are more and more, each year, used in buildings of all kinds, and new outlets are constantly opening for these products.

I am sure that I am doing a favor to my readers by calling their attention to the exceedingly able and interesting address of Mr. Hewitt delivered in September, 1890, before the American Institute of Mining Engineers, on "Iron and Labor," not only because of its comprehensive history of the iron and coal trades, but also for its instructive lessons on social questions connected with the relations of capital and labor.

The report of the American Iron and Steel Association, issued in April last, is the authority for most of the statistics given below. The production of pig iron in the United States, given in net tons, was in the year 1872, 2,854,558; 1880, 4,295,414; 1886, 6,365,328; 1890, 10,307,028; from 1872 to 1878 the product decreased. The increase of production from 1888 to 1889 was 17 per cent.; from 1889 to 1890, 21 per cent. The production of 1890 was about 1,200,000 gross tons larger than that of Great Britain for the same year, and it was 600,000 gross tons larger than the largest year Great Britain ever had, thus placing the United States at the head of the iron-producing countries of the world. Iron was made in twenty-three States of our country in 1890. The total production of Bessemer-steel ingots in the United States was, in 1890, 3,688,871 gross tons, an increase of nearly 26 per cent. over the production of 1889. Great Britain's largest production of Bessemer-steel ingots was in 1889, when it amounted to 2,140,793 gross tons. Our production of steel rails in 1889 was 1,691,264 net tons; in 1890, 2,091,978 net tons. The largest annual production of Great Britain was in 1882, when it amounted to 1,235,785 gross tons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wire nails (nearly all steel), although comparatively a recent development, have become very important. The production in 1890 was 3,135,911 kegs of 100 pounds each. This branch of the trade was built up under a protective duty of 4 cents per pound. The McKinley Bill reduced this duty to 2 cents per pound. These nails are now selling by first hands at $1\frac{99}{100}$ cents per pound, or ten mills less per pound than the present duty. The rods from which these wire nails are made were formerly largely imported from England. The price of the American rod is $37.50 per ton. The first cost of the English rod would be $31.78; add duty of $13.72, making total $45.50. American steel nails are quoted at $5.50 per ton less than they can be imported to-day with the duty of $13.72 added. The last-mentioned facts demonstrate that the cost of an article is not always in a high-tariff country "the foreign cost plus the duty."

As the presence of coal fields is indispensable to the production of iron in any country, it is interesting to note that the increase of our coal production has kept pace with that of iron, with which it is so closely associated.

1870.....	Coal mined, tons.....	28,312,581
1880.....	" " "	65,883,000
1889.....	" " "	137,445,172*

Our excessive silver coinage is the one dark, ominous shadow which projects itself over the country, plainly indicating disaster. If this danger could be eliminated by the common-sense of the people operating upon Congress, there is no question that an era of permanent prosperity would open before the nation. The wise remarks of the President at Albany indicate that there is no prospect of free silver coinage during the present administration; but the introduction of free coinage of silver is not the only thing necessary to cause the withdrawal of gold as a circulating medium. The monthly purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, with its attendant issue of treasury notes, will, in my opinion, inevitably produce this result. It is highly probable that gold would have sold at a premium before Christmas of this year had it not been for our large crops and the universally short crops of cereals in Europe.

As an illustration of the value of the present crops as affecting the prosperity of the country, one of the most prominent and intelligent citizens of the State of Kansas writes:

* These figures are from Mr. Hewitt's address on "Iron and Labor."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"There are thousands of farms in Kansas that have produced crops which can be sold for a sum greater than the actual valuation one year ago of the farms themselves. One instance has come under my observation of a farm, fairly valued at $4,500, producing a crop which has been sold for $8,000. It is stated on good authority that either of the items of property, horses, cattle, hogs, wheat, and corn, could be sold for a sum equal to the mortgage indebtedness of all of the farmers of Kansas, and leave them in possession of the four remaining items."

Within the past four months and before our present crops were assured, while money was loaned at 4½ per cent. in Wall street on six months' credit and payable at maturity in gold, the currency rate was at the same time 6 per cent. This danger-signal will be likely to fly again when the reverse of the position of to-day is realized—*i. e.*, the occurence of short crops in this country with abundant harvests in Europe. Prudent loaners of money, such as savings banks and trust companies, will then necessarily insert gold clauses in their mortgages for self-protection.

The exports and imports of the United States, exclusive of gold, for the year ending June 30, 1891, were $1,729,378,862, with a balance of about forty millions in our favor. This vast exchange was all upon a gold basis, and in accordance with the finances of Europe.

Those who were engaged in foreign trade during the late Civil War will need no reminder of the difficulty and uncertainty that always environ all transactions which represent obligations payable in gold with receipts receivable in a depreciated currency.

If the question is asked, "When will gold sell at a premium under the existing state of things?" an obvious and reasonable reply would be: Gold will be withdrawn from circulation, and the hoarding of this metal will commence whenever the time arrives that importers and foreign bankers believe that it is probable in the near future that a check drawn upon a bank in New York will not be received in payment of a bill of exchange drawn on London.

All prudent men engaged in foreign trade will then convert as speedily as possible their deposits into gold, and the catastrophe of a premium on gold will be at hand. The large banks and bankers of Europe have, before this impending danger, been willing to leave liberal cash balances in the hands of their agents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this country because of the higher rates for money usually prevailing here. Of course the probability of a premium on gold would cause all floating capital of this kind to be withdrawn, unless promises to pay in gold, with all the attendant risks, were entered into on the part of American dealers in foreign exchange.

The Secretary of the Treasury has the power and discretion by act of Congress to issue bonds for the purpose of maintaining the present parity between gold and silver; and Secretary Foster in a recent interview with New York bankers expressed his determination to use this power for that purpose to its fullest extent; but it is not probable that Congress, with its well-known tendency to free coinage, would permit this power to remain long in the hands of the government should such an exigency arise. In the opinion of some of the most experienced bankers and financiers of this country, we have to-day coin and currency of all sorts (gold excepted) sufficient for the needs of the nation. The demands for more currency are fallacious. The idea prevails in some sections, as demonstrated in a recent Ohio political convention, that increased currency and free coinage of silver will give additional capital to those who are at present without accumulated savings of their own. Was there ever a more absurd proposition submitted to an intelligent people? Money flows by a natural law to the money-centres, or where there is concentrated capital. What our free-coinage friends need is increased earnings, and not more currency and silver coins. The Treasury Department and the banks of New York will be glad to send them all the eighty-cent silver dollars and all the national-bank notes and silver bills they can pay for, provided only that the express charges are borne by the receivers. It must be admitted, however, that the Eastern banks are very reluctant to part with their gold reserves, as every bank manager knows.

In financial circles there is so much sensitiveness regarding the gold reserve of the government in the treasury, which is less than 20 per centum of the outstanding obligations, subject to redemption in gold, if the gold standard is maintained, that it would be regarded as an unfriendly act on the part of any national bank to send one-half million greenbacks to the assistant treasurer for redemption in gold coin.

A conspicuous instance very recently came to light in New

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York, by which it appeared that a prominent bank loaned a million of dollars for fifteen days without interest to a foreign banker for the purpose of importing gold from England, with the agreement that as a compensation for the loss of interest the gold so imported should be added to the reserve of the bank, and this was considered a wise move at the time.

At this writing the platform of the Democratic State Convention is announced. It is a matter of great importance and a good omen for the future that both political parties in this State are united in opposition to the free coinage of silver and in favor of honest money.

CHARLES STEWART SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOMEN IN ENGLISH POLITICS.

BY JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P.

MANY a year is in its grave since I wrote an article in an American magazine which I called "The Petticoat in English Politics." The difference between that title and the name I give to this article is more than a mere difference of words. It represents an actual difference in conditions, in facts, in the ideas which I desire to convey. For I think any one would at once understand that to speak of the influence of the petticoat in politics is to speak of a purely feminine influence, potent because it is feminine, while the influence of women in politics gives the idea of the influence which women exercise as politicians in the open field—not as women playing on the weaknesses of men and cajoling and manipulating them and making instruments of them. The one title represents what Stuart Mill used to call the illegitimate influence of women; the other their legitimate influence. This is exactly the idea which I sought to convey in my former article and which I seek to convey in this. I was writing then of the illegitimate influence of woman in English politics; I am writing now of her legitimate influence.

Only seventeen or eighteen years have passed, and in that interval the position of woman in the public life of England has wholly changed. Then there was hardly anything that could be called a legitimate influence of woman making itself felt in the political affairs of England. There were, to be sure, various organizations for obtaining the suffrage and free employment for women; and I think the experiment of admitting women to seats on the school boards had just begun to be tried. But not much impression on the old order had been made, and the influence of women on political life was an influence exercised over men and through men; an influence of the drawing-room and the *salon*—an influence, in short, of the petticoat.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now the state of things has greatly changed. The influence of the petticoat has gone down ever so much, and that of the woman has come up. In this conservative old country the cause of woman's rights has made far greater progress than with you in the United States. When our first system of national education was started,—only think, it is but a few years since we established our first really national system of education in England,—women were allowed to be elected to the school boards. People then went to look on at the meetings of the London School Board out of mere curiosity to see the women members sitting there. When two years ago our county councils were formed, the act of Parliament did not make it quite clear whether women were or were not eligible as members. Some women stood for the London council and other councils. Three, I think, were elected for London. One was Lady Sandhurst, the widow of a famous soldier; another bore a name well known in America—Miss Jane Cobden. The rival over whom Lady Sandhurst had prevailed—a man—disputed her legal right to sit, and brought an action, the result of which was that she was declared to be disqualified. In the other two cases no attempt was made to claim the seats, and the ladies therefore remain and sit and speak and vote until the law is made more clear one way or the other and the question finally settled. Now, I do not in the least blame the man who went to law with Lady Sandhurst for her seat. He was accused of being ungallant; but, after all, these are serious questions not to be settled by a mere tender of unsolicited courtesy to woman's sex. I am sure Lady Sandhurst would not have thanked her opponent for telling her that as a woman she must be humored and must be allowed to have her own way in everything. But there can be no doubt as to the manner in which the controversy will end. The act will be modified so as to make it clear that women are eligible for the county councils. Then the distance is not far to the Parliamentary franchise for women.

Just at present we have two schools of policy as regards the Parliamentary suffrage for women. Women themselves are divided on the question. One division of the party advocate the seeking of the suffrage only for women who have what I may call the householder's qualification. The householder, the person responsible for the rent and the rates, is the person who ought to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have the vote, no matter what that person's sex may be. This looks a fair as well as a moderate demand. But see what it comes to. It means that, speaking generally, all married women shall be disqualified. The vast majority of married women are not registered as householders. The husband is the householder and the husband has the vote. Of course there would be exceptions in the case of some women of property who have houses of their own, as well as their husbands' houses, and who are the registered owners of their own houses. But these exceptions do not much affect the general fact that the household suffrage leaves the married women out. The women voters would be spinsters and widows. The other, or more advanced, division of the woman-suffrage movement go boldly in for the good wife having the vote as well as the good man. They contend that before long there will be what is virtually manhood suffrage in these countries. Indeed, it almost amounts to that already. Therefore they may argue that there should at the same time be womanhood suffrage. According to the principle which the less advanced reformers are contending for, a man's mistress, as it often has been said, might have the vote, while his wife would be prevented by law from having it.

The actual movement, the political and constitutional movement, has not been making any very marked progress of late. In the House of Commons it has been rather at a standstill. The loss of Mr. Courtney as a leader was a real loss indeed. Mr. Courtney is a man of high political position and influence, a strong man with a firm will, who could not be bent or played with by evasive ministers of the crown. But Mr. Courtney was appointed to the office of chairman of committees,—the office, it may be called, of deputy speaker,—and it would not be suitable that he should lead a party in the House any more. The present leader of the older and less advanced movement is Mr. Walter McLaren, a young member who has not yet had a chance of showing what he can do. All I can say of him is that he comes of a good stock. His mother is a sister of John Bright; his father was a man of great practical ability who sat in the House of Commons for many years and was much respected there; his brother was in the House for some years and will no doubt be there again, and he was noted for tenacity in sticking to a purpose.

But the whole question of woman suffrage has been shoved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aside by controversies of more imminent and pressing interest. It is an axiom in Parliament now that until the Irish question is settled nothing else can be seriously taken up. In any case the woman-suffrage cause will have to be worked with far greater energy in Parliament when its time comes—or else its time will never come. The House of Commons never makes a reform simply because the reform is one that ought to be made. It makes a reform only because and when it has to be made. Incessant pressure must be brought to bear by those who have a movement in hand. They must make themselves disagreeable, intolerable, to each and every government, until at last some government finds it necessary to come to terms with them, take the reform out of their hands, and carry it as a measure of administration. It would not be too much to say that in the imperial Parliament no measure is ever carried through by a private member or even by an independent party. That is not the way in which success is obtained. The independent party has to keep pegging away with its proposal, to try to force it on the attention of the House; to ballot for days on which it may be brought on; to make it a test question at elections; to throw the voting strength of the party against any and every candidate who will not pledge himself to support its reform; to vote in the House of Commons against every ministry who will not promise to give it a fair consideration to; make the question an inconvenient and disturbing influence for ministry and opposition alike. Then at last the opposition takes it up, and perhaps compels the government to adopt it and bring in a measure of their own to carry out the reform. Thus and not otherwise are reforms carried in England. Governments in this country are unlike *Falstaff* and his reasons—they will give anything on compulsion.

The woman-suffrage party have not worked energetically enough so far. I am speaking now merely of what ought to be, from the point of view of those who lead the movement. Personally and politically I feel grateful to them for their quietude; for I am deeply concerned in a great question of the most pressing interest, and I am glad that they have not intervened too persistently with their own work and thus helped to delay the other. But they will have sooner or later to make themselves very disagreeable if they are determined to have anything speedily done. Meanwhile the interval of what may almost be called

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parliamentary inaction is by no means an interval of general inactivity. The country is being rapidly and incessantly educated up to the woman-suffrage principle. For instance, we have none of us any longer any feeling of curiosity, any idea of eccentricity, when we hear a woman called on to deliver a speech at a public meeting. On both sides of the political field women exert themselves in a manner which might make Aristophanes turn in his grave. On many platforms now women are speakers as regularly as men. Women of high social position, women of aristocratic rank, are ready to address a public meeting.

One of the most marvellous political organizations of our days is the Primrose League. This is really a league of Tory ladies got up to supply the deficiencies of energy and of eloquence which were to be observed in the organizations of the Tory men. Lysistrata herself might be proud of the spirit in which the dames of the Primrose League lead the way in their public demonstrations, and the tame and quiet manner in which the men have been trained to take the second place. The Primrose ladies do not confine their work to the making of speeches, although they do a vast amount of speech-making and some of them do it very well. They organize election arrangements; they canvass electors; they manage the work of the polling days; they lend their carriages to bring voters to the polling-places; they take voters in their carriages and personally charioteer them to the poll. As Napoleon said that the business of war consisted mainly in the bringing together of the greatest number of men at a given place and a given time, so the Primrose dames confidently maintain that the success of an election now is often only a question of bringing together the greatest number of carriages at a given place and a given time. They beat the Liberals in the number of carriages, it must be owned. To be sure, the Liberals have won nearly all the recent disputable bye-elections; but then there were tremendous questions involved which did not leave much margin for doubtful votes—and I should like to know where the Tories would have been but for their irrepressible, indomitable Primrose League!

On the Liberal side women have begun to organize and intervene now with steady purpose and sustained energy. Many women of birth and rank stump the country as Liberal agitators. Among the various Liberal delegations sent over to Ireland during the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last three years women have played a prominent and important part.

In London all the old influence of the *salon* has practically disappeared. No woman now plays in London life the part which was once played by Lady Palmerston. There is no political *salon* now in that sense. Some great ladies give parties which have political objects; but they are gatherings only of the one political set, and do not profess to aim at any business of propaganda and conversion. The suffrage is too wide-spread and deep-laid for such influences as those of the old *salon* to have any effect on an election now. In the old days many a man sat for a borough or county which might be said to belong to him; where his family were all-powerful. The suffrage was very high and narrow, and the electors were all more or less under his control. Now, suppose Lady Palmerston, on the eve of some great division in the House of Commons, were to manage to talk such a man over, and get him to vote for Lord Palmerston, instead of voting, as he had first intended to do, against him: there would be something decidedly gained for Lord Palmerston's cause. The member whom Lady Palmerston had converted would care nothing for the opinion of his constituents. He would bid his will avouch his vote; and when the next election came on his constituents would have to return him all the same.

But the condition of things is very different now. The despot of the old days has to be a very humble supplicant in these new days. Every peasant on the land has his vote, and votes under the protection of the ballot; and he can afford to withstand the little tyrant of his fields. Of what avail would be the blandishments of any Lady Palmerston for the member of Parliament who had the terror of Hodge's vote before his mind and his conscience? The *salon* is gone because the days of the *salon* are over. In its stead has come a new institution, led and officered for the most part by women; and this is the political garden party or the political drawing-room party. Some great lady throws her grounds and her house open on a fixed day, and the Primrose dames, on the one hand, or the Women's Liberal Association, on the other, get up a garden party or a drawing-room party. The services of some well-known Parliamentary orators are secured, and the whole affair is announced by widespread advertisement. Invitations are showered about, and there for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once the social barriers are utterly broken down. Men and women of all classes meet in those hospitable grounds and under that hospitable roof. The duchess and the dressmaker are standing side by side. The noble earl leans familiarly on the shoulder of the British workingman. If the noble earl is invited to address the meeting, be sure some British workingman will be invited to address it too. Happy above women is the fortunate hostess who can secure the presence of Mr. Gladstone on the one side or of Mr. Balfour, let us say, on the other.

Is all this sort of thing mere play-acting—mere farce—mere sham? I do not think so. I think there is a good deal of reality beneath the surface of it, and I am glad to see the classes brought together, anyhow. The state of things no longer admits of the ignoble relationship of the patron and the patronized. The workingman has his vote now; the working woman will have hers before very long; and in the meantime she is a figure and an influence in political life, and is not a creature to be merely patronized.

The truth is that the working classes in England are growing more powerful and the aristocracy are growing less powerful. It must be so. This country is governed by the House of Commons, and the House of Commons is governed by the constituencies; and the workingmen count for much in every constituency. I do not see the slightest decrease in the ambition of Englishmen of any class, any rank, to be members of the House of Commons. We are always told that the dignity and the attractiveness of the House of Commons are being lowered every day; that it is becoming a rough-and-tumble sort of assembly, and that men of high social position shrink from accepting seats in it. Do they? Some men in every class have always shrunk from a Parliamentary life. But do men of rank shrink from it now more than ever they did? Not the least in the world. I happen to know a good deal about English elections, and I never knew a time when men of high social position were more anxious to get a chance of coming into the House of Commons. Well, but to get into the House of Commons one must have some support from the workingman. The workingman gets to be regarded as an important person; and, all apart from any question of selfish advantage to be gained out of him and gained by paying court to him, the English aristocrat begins to see that he is a real personage; that he is a man and a brother; that there is something in him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same will be found true of the working women. Not very long ago I was one of the speakers at a meeting in Prince's Hall, in Piccadilly, which was presided over by Lord Dunraven, who is well known in the United States. It was a meeting called for the purpose of trying to bring about some better conditions of labor for the poor working women in the East End of London. Many men made good speeches,—peers and members of the House of Commons, and clergymen—there was even a bishop there—and Dissenting or Nonconformist ministers, who are usually endowed with a special gift of eloquence, which goes home to the heart of a popular audience. But the speech which interested me most was made by a working woman. It was not merely because she understood the practical question better than we did; it was not because, like the waitress whom Disraeli describes in his "Coningsby," through the mouth of his Sidonia, she was "mistress of her subject." Her expert knowledge, of course, counted for a great deal. But beyond this there was to my mind a remarkable capacity in her for taking at once a broad and a practical view of any subject; for recognizing the inevitable necessity of compromise; for accepting the conditions under which reform of any kind has to be made; for admitting limitations. Besides all this, there was a certain composure about her; a certain dignity of manner. She was neither obtrusive nor diffident. She seemed to say in effect: "You must take me as I am; I don't pretend to be a lady, in the conventional sense of the word, and I don't pretend to be a good speaker, but I have something to say and I want to say it. I am not anxious to make a speech, but I have something to say to you which ought to be said."

Now, I think that woman personified fairly the best aspect of the woman's movement in England. I think woman is coming forward because she has something to say which she feels ought to be said. This is the strictly legitimate influence of woman. It is not the influence of the petticoat. It is the intelligence of woman coming to the help of the intelligence of man. I am utterly unable to see how this comradeship in the management of affairs can either lower the dignity of man or unsex the nature of woman. may say at once that I am an utter disbeliever in the possibility of unsexing woman, or man either. I am very fond of reading Ovid's "Metamorphoses"; but I disbelieve some of the stories.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The education of women is advancing every day. We have colleges for girls now in England just as you have in America. I have been reading an interesting article in the monthly magazine *Atalanta* on Oxford and Cambridge colleges for women, by the Honorable Eva Knatchbull-Hugessen, who is a daughter of Lord Brabourne, and who was herself educated at Newnham College, Cambridge. Both Oxford and Cambridge have now opened all their examinations to women; Cambridge is no longer alone in this advance. There are four colleges from which a girl can choose. She may go to Girton or to Newnham, at Cambridge; she may go to Lady Margaret Hall or Somerville Hall, at Oxford. A girl, although she cannot obtain a degree, can, Miss Knatchbull-Hugessen tells us, "go through exactly the same course of study as her brother, be it classics, mathematics, science, history, or modern languages." Of course the working girl has not much to do with Girton or Lady Margaret Hall, but there are institutions growing up everywhere in England which aim at the education and the training of the working girl—and I am by no means certain that the young Englishwoman of good position did not want her education looked after quite as much in proportion as her lowly-born and hard-working sister. All this development of education among high and low will not only tend to make women fit to have an influence on public life, but will inevitably make them anxious to exert that influence.

When the popular franchise was carried in 1867, against the uttermost efforts of Robert Lowe, now Lord Sherbrooke, Lowe exclaimed that the time had come "to educate our masters." The workingmen, he said, were to become our masters by virtue of the franchise and their numbers, and the only thing left for us to do was to educate them, so that at least they might understand how to exercise a wholesome dominion over us. I do not know whether the women, when they get the franchise, are going to be our masters. They will have the advantage of numbers certainly, and if it should come to a continuous struggle of women as women against men as men, we should have to give in. But I am not afraid of these portentous eventualities which have a terror for so many persons of both sexes. I have not seen women very much in antagonism with men, and I have noticed that the world here in England has gone on in very much the same, orderly sort of humdrum way since women have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sitting on the school boards and the county councils. But I am very glad indeed that the education of women is given over to something better than the old-fashioned "boarding-school for young ladies"—the school at which Amelia Sedley learned and Becky Sharp taught. I am glad that the discipline of a regular college is applied to the instruction and training of young women as well as of young men. Perhaps the education of women of the poorer class, as well as the richer, is a little overdone here and there. Perhaps there is a good deal too much of cramming. Everything gets overdone somewhere. Cramming is a good deal too much the practice in England for boys as well as for girls—for boys, indeed, much more than for girls. But it is impossible to found or devise any educational system which some schools and some teachers will not press too far; and I think that, on the whole, we need not be in the least alarmed at the prospect of our English boys and girls learning too much.

It is to my mind an almost unmixed blessing that education should have begun at last to diffuse itself freely and easily among young English women of all classes. Perhaps it is just as well that the cause of woman suffrage should not have made more rapid progress through the House of Commons. The intermediate time of delay has been well spent. It has been spent in the education of the public to understand how much the movement means in one sense and how little it means in another sense. It means, to my mind, ever so much in consolidation and little or nothing in disruption or dissolution. My excellent friend Mr. Samuel Smith, a member of Parliament, whose earnest philanthropic purposes are well known to many Americans, has, I read, been giving it as his opinion that womanhood suffrage in England must lead to the ruin of the British Empire. That poor British Empire! How has it managed to hold together so long? Every reform threatens to ruin it. How many times have I not heard of its ruin! "These truces with the infidel," says Wamba, the son of Witless, in Scott's "Ivanhoe," "make an old man of me." How so? Because every truce lasted, or rather was appointed to last, a great many years; and yet somehow every truce got quickly broken,—not always by the infidels, be it observed,—and so poor Wamba found that he could count up so many ten years' truces

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his own time as to make him already a patriarch of more extended lifetime than Methuselah himself!

Now, these ruinings of the British Empire make a very, very old man of me. I have always from my earliest days been hearing of their coming on within a specified number of years, and all because of some reform which unthinking, unpatriotic, and "un-English" statesmen were endeavoring to introduce. The reforms have been carried and the empire has gone on rather stronger than before, after each successive change. But, of course, it is only fair to give the prophets their appointed time before we proclaim that their prophecy has failed—and it is in that sense that I begin to think how very, very old I must be, seeing that I can recall the failure, the absolute failure, of such a number of drear vaticinations. We must trust a little to human nature.

The immense change which I have described in the position of women in English political life even within a few short years has not, so far as I have ever heard, made much alteration in the nature of English women. I have not noticed that English women care less about their country than they did before any of them ever sat on a school board or a county council. I have not observed or learned that women have acquired a greater influence over men than they had in the old days. I am inclined to think that the contrary, on the whole, has been the effect of the change. I am inclined to think that the illegitimate influence, the unseen influence, the influence of the petticoat, was stronger over men than the open and legitimate influence of woman in politics now; and I am convinced that for every case in which that illegitimate influence worked for good it worked in many cases for evil. I am less anxious, however, to argue as to the advantages or disadvantages of the change than to call the attention of my American readers to the fact that such a change has taken place, and to induce them to consider its extent and its significance.

There is now no country in the world where women are so openly and avowedly in the political field as England. The United States no doubt come next; but, as I said before, the United States do not show such a growth in the development of woman in politics as is shown by conservative, slow-moving England. When a movement grows in that way, I for one am inclined to think that we may safely accept it as a movement for good. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was reading lately a poem I had not read for a long time—a poem which had a certain celebrity in my younger years, and which tells us that the poet had lost his faith in humanity—had been disillusionized,—they were easily illusionized and disillusionized in those far-off days,—and there remained to him "in the downcast temple's dust but faith in God alone." Now, I must declare that, even granting due license to poetic mood, I do not quite understand how that state of feeling can explain itself. For how the poet can retain his faith in God and utterly lose his faith in man, whom God may be supposed to have had some good purpose in making, is a problem which passes my understanding. My friend Mr. Samuel Smith has most assuredly not lost his faith in God or in man either. He may be recommended to extend the sphere of his trustfulness and have faith in woman too. The ballot-box will not turn her from that which she is into a totally different creature. Her influence and her advice and her coöperation, which have hitherto worked not badly, on the whole, in the making and keeping of the British Empire, will not utterly become an influence of decay and disruption and dissolution, simply because she adds to her right to sit on the school boards and the county councils, and to speak on what platforms she chooses, the small additional right of voting for or against—for, I hope—the election of my friend Mr. Samuel Smith.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO IMPROVE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

BY EX-MAYOR HART OF BOSTON, MAYOR DAVIDSON OF BALTIMORE, MAYOR BISHOP OF BUFFALO, AND MAYOR NOONAN OF ST. LOUIS.

IT IS generally felt and often stated that the government of American cities is a failure. At the same time it is conceded that our system of national and State governments is a success. If the government of the country at large and of the separate States be reasonably satisfactory, it is humiliating that we should make a failure of city government. Is it possible that we can govern the whole, and must fail in governing a part? I do not think so. Those who consider all American city government a failure have latterly pointed to Glasgow, Birmingham, and Berlin as models for us to follow. But in our national and State constitutions we have not followed foreign models very closely, and that seems to offer some reason for the belief that in matters of city government we shall do well to propose and execute what is best under our particular circumstances. Mr. Simon Sterne points out that American cities differ very widely, both in theory and in practice, from the cities of other countries. It is to be inferred that the discovery and the administration of the best government for American cities are an American problem, to be solved on the basis of American facts and precedents.

The American theory is that the State creates cities, that cities have no rights not conferred by the State, and that the State may destroy municipal corporations at will. Does it not follow, then, that the lack of efficiency so generally charged against our city governments should be laid in part at the door of the States that created the cities and gave them what power and character they have? If the national government had the same power over States which the latter have over cities, is it not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely that our States would be in the same predicament in which we find our cities? As a matter of fact, the rights of our States have been fully saved while we have established and maintained a national constitution; but if the towns and cities of America ever had any inherent rights, they have been disregarded or destroyed by the States. Yet it is not, perhaps, a mere dream to think that towns and cities might bear the same relations to a State which the latter bears to the national government.

The larger part of the population of Massachusetts lives in cities. Under our law this majority is deemed incapable of making and changing the fundamental law of cities; but as part of the commonwealth the residents of our cities are supposed to have almost sovereign power. Boston as a city is treated as incapable of self-government; in conjunction with smaller cities and country towns it is thought nearly omnipotent or omniscient, and certainly most wise and independent. In the country at large, and in every State where there are considerable cities, the taxes, the debts, the public works, and the number of public servants of the municipalities greatly exceed those of the States as such. Yet the States have full self-government, and the great municipalities have not. As the self-government of States is a help rather than a hindrance to national self-government, is it not possible and desirable to let our great municipalities enjoy a larger measure of local self-government? We have established and vindicated our national government. Our State governments have never been in danger, and are not now. The constitutional duty of the immediate future, it seems to me, lies in the direction of simplifying, improving, and, perhaps, enlarging municipal government.

The true model and the best precedent for the constitution of an American city, I venture to think, are to be found in our national and State constitutions. They all draw the right line between legislative, judicial, and executive work. This distribution of public power appears to be of fundamental importance. It is probably safe to think that the main reason why so many of our city governments fail to give satisfaction is to be found in the exercise of legislative and executive power by the same municipal officer or body. Some American mayors or other administrative officers still exercise judicial functions, whence the whole class are popularly called magistrates and addressed as "your honor," as if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every mayor was a judge, or ought to be. Aldermen and councilmen, whose duty is plainly legislative, have too often done purely administrative work, at times under State authority, and usually to the detriment of responsible government. To check the exercise of administrative work by aldermen or councilmen, the power and prerogative of mayors have of late been greatly increased; and there is some danger of overloading mayors with such legislative work as an undue share in the laying of taxes or making appropriations. The less a mayor has to do with these, beyond making recommendations and exercising the veto power, the better. Give the mayor full executive power, but keep him out of legislative work. That there can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, is an axiom quoted by *The Federalist* from Montesquieu.

It is not certain that the mayor should have the absolute power of appointing his subordinates or any other public officers. The power of removal should be vested in the mayor; but the appointing power may properly be limited by giving the board of aldermen the right to confirm or reject. The mayor should have the veto power over all acts of his city council. In turn, he should be required to give reasonable information to the city council on his own acts, as well as on those of the departments under him; and executive appointments may well undergo the ordeal of aldermanic acceptance or rejection in order to prevent mayors from ever thinking that, for the time, they are supreme. The danger that good appointees may be rejected is probably not greater than that hasty or ill-considered appointments will be made. The executive and the legislative branch should be separated; they should not be wholly independent of each other, for the government is to be one, with its duties carefully separated.

As the city council should have the power to order taxes and to make appropriations, beside making ordinances and authorizing public works, its prerogative is necessarily great and needs balancing. The best check to hasty legislation and foolish appropriations is found in a legislature of two branches, each having a negative on the other. If the board of aldermen have the power of passing upon executive appointments, the other branch, usually called the common council, may well have the power and prerogative of originating appropriations. Aldermen should be stripped of all administrative work, if we are to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have a responsible government of cities; but the other chamber should have equal power with the board of aldermen. The system has worked well in our national and State legislatures, and should be adopted in all cities. It is convenient to make the board of aldermen small, and the common council sufficiently numerous to give all classes a representation and spokesmen. All public servants should receive salaries, and all perquisites should be abolished.

A city council of two branches, it seems to me, is absolutely essential. The city council holds the purse-strings, it orders the taxes, and it incurs the debt for which all taxable property is in effect mortgaged. This power is so great that it should not be exercised by one body alone, nor until the matter is at least twice discussed in public by rival branches. Even under a public law limiting taxes and municipal indebtedness, some discretion will rest with the city council. This discretion is less likely to be abused by two rival houses than by one house, especially if the latter be so small as to resemble a board of directors. And city men must learn at their peril that in the matter of dollars and cents their city council is more important than their State legislature.

A clear division of executive departments, I am aware, is extremely difficult, and has not been attained anywhere. The departments in Washington are a jumble, except that the cabinet offices are fairly defined. Below there is less system than the cause of good government requires. City departments are equally confusing, at least in the large cities. Here, then, is a great problem for city councils to solve. This calls for a high order of talent; and that we shall never command unless we dignify city government by giving it some independence. In an emergency only, the national government will interfere with a State; the State may well show the like spirit to its great cities, the homes of wealth and commerce. One of the reasons why men of affairs take so small a part in the government of their own cities is, perhaps, the fact that States can rule cities at will. A remedy is sought, not in self-government, which is nearly extinct, but in appeals to State legislatures. Possibly for the same reason the municipal spirit is so weak in the greatest of all our cities. Yet we ought to learn our first lesson in government and public duty in our own homes. New England still has its priceless town meetings,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where local affairs are settled in the best manner possible. There our best men received their early training. The town of Boston was never incorporated. It exercised prescriptive rights. The cities of America are creatures of the State. When our city taxes are squandered, or we think they are squandered, the legislature of the State, with its country members, is invoked to supply a remedy. Instead of outreasoning and outvoting our opponents in city affairs, as we do in State and national elections, we appeal to men who pay no tax in our cities and could have no intimate acquaintance with the giant problems of city government. No city, I fear, will ever be well governed that does not invite the highest talent, and that fails to hold out the highest inducement to men of light and leading. The problem of city government, I believe, can never be solved except by the city itself and by its home citizens. Instead of relieving men of municipal duties, the latter should be increased. And a great duty well discharged should find its just reward.

A city government should be a continuous body. Mayors should be elected for periods of three or four years. If for three years, aldermen should be elected for four years, one-fourth of their number being elected annually, or one-half biennially. Councilmen should be elected for at least two years, and half the council should be elected annually. The New England system of annually electing an entire city government, it seems to me, is an unfortunate misapplication of town methods. The great Chief-Justice Shaw, who framed our city charter, failed to perceive, possibly, that cities require a representative government, and that towns do not. It was he who made our New England aldermen semi-executive officers and gave us one-year governments.

While I differ with Chief-Justice Shaw and other lawyers, it is quite clear in my mind that we need lawyers of the first order —men like Shaw and Judge Dillon—if we intend to put the constitutions and laws of our great cities upon a firm and lasting basis. I think that the power of our great cities should be increased at the expense of our States. In that work of the future we shall need the best legal talent the country has. We shall need great organizers. We need a *Federalist* for our great American cities. But the best law and the best city constitution cannot take the place of good citizenship. Indeed, the cause here alluded to by a mere layman, who has been twice mayor of Boston,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is altogether hopeless if our leading cities are to be mere markets, and if citizens consider their public duty discharged by the payment of taxes, a vote when the time comes, and habitual grumbling at our own government. Our government is about what we make it. If it be inefficient, we have made it so. If we desire to improve it, we are free to do our best. But no great improvement is possible until the majority, animated by public and worthy motives, takes actual hold and vindicates public opinion duly informed and properly guided. We must do for our cities what the fathers of a century ago did so well for the State and the nation.

THOMAS N. HART,
Ex-Mayor of Boston.

THE essential difficulty in the administration of the affairs of the majority of American cities arises from three principal causes:

First, The apathy and indifference which the majority of the better class of citizens display with regard to taking an active part in municipal government. This disposition can have no other tendency than to gradually delegate the most important functions of a municipality to those whose training and qualifications poorly fit them for the discharge of duties involving large responsibility.

There is no American city where this condition of things has not been a matter of more than ordinary solicitude among the earnest thinkers, who, while recognizing the dangerous tendencies involved in the avoidance of the duties and responsibilities of public office, have yet discovered no remedy. How vastly different is the condition of affairs in some prominent cities of the old world—Berlin, for instance—where a refusal to serve in some of the highest municipal offices is punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both; where the obligation to do so is regarded in such a sacred light that neglect or indifference is at once a mark of dishonor and unworthy citizenship! Were it possible always to secure the services of the ablest and best citizens only, the course of legislation and the general conduct of the affairs of a municipal government would invariably be upon those lines of common-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sense and good judgment in which the very highest degree of success is attained in the private walks of life and business enterprise. Under present conditions the danger is frequently incurred that the wise acts of one council may be frustrated by some subsequent legislation, characterized by cupidity, ignorance, and incapacity.

Second, A most serious drawback is the very narrow limit of the powers of the municipality under the State legislature.

Suppose the case of a private corporation which attempted to do business surrounded by the hampering and restrictive measures which from time to time are suggested to the average country legislator, whose majority power confers upon him the privilege of continually agitating the hayseed clustered around his brain, in efforts to devise new systems which will relieve him, and throw the burden of taxation upon his supposed legitimate prey dwelling in the city. No business can be transacted by our cities without the practical supervision of a State legislature, which rarely realizes that the city has any rights worthy of much respect; and therefore the popular idea of self-government is a mere illusion in the majority of our municipal corporations, for no power exists, in reality, to do any act for the well-being of the citizens, or for the advancement of the material interests of the community, save such as may have previously, in one form or another, received the sanction of the State authorities. I maintain, therefore, that cities of certain grades should hold in many respects the identical relation to the States that the States hold to the general government of the country, and while proper and reasonable restrictions should not be relinquished,—restrictions preventing the disregard of the ordinary principles of law and order,—the city should be invested with discretionary powers for the transaction of its business to much the same extent as is allowed to private corporations.

The fact is, however, quite undeniable that it would be unwise to make such a radical change in the system of municipal government unless the *ensemble* of the local body politic is also changed, and elevated in mental and moral tone, so as to avoid the misuse of the enlarged powers which would thus be acquired. In other words, it is conceded that to small capacity, discrimination, and judgment should only be allowed limited scope for attempts at the exercise of these qualities; and hence the second proposi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion is interdependent and conditional upon the first suggestion of the need of a more enlarged interest upon the part of the best citizens in the affairs of government.

Third, The mayor should have absolute power of appointing and removing his subordinates, and should, in that manner, incur substantially the sole responsibility for the manner in which the business of the city is conducted. The ability of a council to interfere, under a power to confirm or reject nominations, when some political favorite is to be served or saved, is an injustice to the mayor charged with the duty of appointment, and often hinders the proper transaction of business; it places in office or retains in position a much lower order of talent than public opinion or the self-respect of the appointing officer would allow, were the power to appoint final and absolute.

There is no reason why our city governments should be considered failures, and they would not be so considered if the majority of the people who live in cities desired their affairs to be conducted on the simple lines of common-sense and prudence which are followed in every branch of private enterprise, and had the energy to enforce their wishes; but the lamentable truth is that such is *not* the case. No man who has had opportunity to observe closely can come to any other conclusion than that the application of strict business principles to city business is calculated to excite derision upon the part of the masses.

This is illustrated in almost the majority of instances where the interest of a city and that of a private corporation come in contact; for in such cases it is invariably charged that those who stand firmly for the protection of the city are manifesting a hostile spirit toward "public improvements," and hence conscientious city officials are subject to ridicule for doing just what a private individual would be censured for not doing.

The application of business principles in requiring employees of our cities to discharge their duty to their employer—the corporation—with fidelity, does not meet with the approval of the whole community, for it is frequently urged as an ameliorating circumstance, in cases of neglect of duty, that the "efficient party service" of the offender is ample cause for mitigating the censure which has been incurred.

The common-sense recognition of the elementary principles of finance is often ignored in a manner which would be considered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unpardonable in private affairs : loans are created, but the important element of a sinking-fund, adequately providing for the hour of redemption, is frequently lost sight of, and it is vastly more popular to experience the temporary enjoyment of a low tax-rate than to make proper provision to avoid the incubus of debt.

In conclusion, the whole question of more efficient city government will be solved when politics are permitted to have no more place in the management of our cities than in individual or corporate enterprise, when the individual citizen realizes the obligation to do his part in holding public office whenever called upon to perform such service, when the powers of self-government are not usurped by the State, and when responsibility is lodged in one chief executive officer whose discretion, ability, character, and standing will be a sufficient guarantee to the community that its best interests will be conserved with absolute fidelity.

ROBERT C. DAVIDSON,
Mayor of Baltimore.

THAT municipal government in American cities is unsatisfactory in results is an established fact, and the city of Buffalo is not an exception to the rule.

Indeed, through the courtesy of the unreliable Eleventh Census our city is made to appear as one of the shining examples of expensive municipal administration. But while that report does great injustice to Buffalo by its inaccurate statements of administrative expenses, yet it is unfortunately true that the results attained are not commensurate with the cost.

Why this condition should long exist is a problem not easy of solution, and the slight success attending the most earnest efforts to correct it is the source of the keenest disappointment to those who are intrusted with executive office. From a careful consideration of the subject, and after the experience of nearly two years as mayor of Buffalo, I am convinced that the fault is not entirely with those who are intrusted with administrative office, but is deeply rooted in our system of municipal control. The fundamental law of our cities is a charter. This charter is granted by legislative enactment, and provides with minutest detail the plan of government, the particular officers, their specific

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duties, and the limitation of their powers. I believe that this system is not the one to secure the best results, for the reason that the people of the several cities, who are the ones most interested in the powers to be exercised under these grants or charters, do not have enough voice in the framing of those powers. The municipal government cannot fairly be compared with or modelled strictly after the State or national government, because the needs it must serve and the difficulties it must overcome are so numerous, so diverse, so peculiarly local in character, and so intimately affect the individual and the family. And yet the very difference seems to me to be the strongest reason why cities should be permitted, like the States, to govern themselves, under certain general and well-defined restrictions.

The Legislature of New York is largely composed of men who, elected from what may be termed rural constituencies, are unacquainted with the actual conditions of living in our large cities, and with the great questions that must be considered and settled by the officers of those cities. And this Legislature, at its last session, enacted seven special laws relating to pavements, schoolhouses, parks, etc., in the city of Buffalo, of the necessity for which only six of the one hundred and sixty members could have any personal knowledge; and that was an unusually small number of such enactments for one session. It is true that these special laws are usually enacted only at the request of the municipality interested; but it is also true that, in the past, proposed laws of great importance to cities have been delayed for years, and sometimes defeated, after repeated requests for their enactment from the cities concerned, and other laws, relating to the government of some of our larger cities, have been enacted, against the most earnest protest of the people of those cities, to serve personal or partisan ends. It is not unreasonable to believe that better results would be attained by permitting such legislation to be considered and settled by the people of the several cities, or their immediate representatives, rather than by a body of disinterested strangers, ignorant of the particular needs, and not responsible to the people of those cities for the result.

I believe, therefore, that the legislative control over municipal governments should only be to provide general laws for the incorporation of cities and limiting the corporate powers that may be exercised; and that each city should be permitted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frame its own charter, subject to those restrictions, and adopt and amend it by vote of its own citizens. I am quite sure that if such power were intrusted to the citizens of Buffalo, its exercise would be uniformly for the benefit of the city. The powers of municipal government should, I believe, be vested in legislative and executive departments; the legislative department to be elective and to consist of two bodies, one elected from and representing different wards or other divisions, and the other composed of a smaller number of members, elected by and representing the whole city. Each body should be a check upon the other. The executive power should be vested in the mayor and, under his supervision, in the heads of different departments. The mayor and such heads of departments as do not require special qualifications should be elective; those heads of departments whose duties require technical knowledge or professional skill and training should be appointed by the mayor. The power of removal should accompany the power of appointment, but should be so guarded as to prevent its abuse. The new charter of the city of Buffalo, enacted by the Legislature of New York at its last session, is, in my judgment, a fair exposition of the proper distribution and limitations of municipal powers. It was framed by a committee of representative citizens, whose selection and deliberations were suggestive of a constitutional convention, and is, I think, a fair example of the practical working of the system I have outlined.

But while the adoption of "home rule" for cities would avoid many of the present difficulties of municipal government, there are many evils that can be cured by the people themselves. The affairs of a city are simply the business of a great corporation, and should be administered as such. The members of the legislative body or bodies constitute the board of directors, and the people, who are the stockholders, should exercise the same care in electing them to secure competent and fit men as they do in choosing the officers and directors of their private corporations. The business methods of the city should be as simple as possible, and the subordinates in the several departments should be chosen with proper regard for their fitness and ability to perform the duties of the positions they are to fill; they should receive such compensation as is reasonable for the services rendered, and their number should be limited by the work to be done. The best re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sults can be most often secured by infrequent changes; yet retention in office, whatever the grade, either elective or appointive, should be conditioned solely upon honest and successful service.

Our cities increase so rapidly in population, surprising the most sanguine students, that to provide the improvements necessary for the health and convenience of the people requires large expenditures and burdensome taxation, and it is in expenditures for such improvements that the greatest abuses have existed. Let us, however, have home control of our own municipal affairs, unhampered by undue legislative interference or control, and I am confident that the thinking, active, working taxpayers will insist that their public business be conducted solely for the public good, and then the problem of the government of cities will be much nearer solution.

CHARLES F. BISHOP,
Mayor of Buffalo.

THE problem of city government is one worthy of the most careful consideration of our wisest and most conservative people. As far as possible the plan should be in accord with that of our national and State governments. In the nature of things there must be considerable dissimilarity. The bulwark of freedom is the division of power. The safety of the people is the system of checks of one department on another. It is a practical proposition, universally acknowledged and acted upon in business circles, and one which lies at the foundation of bookkeeping, that mistakes can only be avoided where the work of one department is subject to review by another, and where the work of both must correspond, forming thereby a mathematical trial balance.

The framers of our federal constitution recognized this principle and expressed it in that instrument. The division of power into three coördinate, yet distinct and restraining, branches is the acme of governmental wisdom. The division of the legislative into two branches, elected by different means, for different terms, and from different classes of the community, has proven most salutary. Thus the Senate, elected by the legislature (or the whole body of the people of the State), is generally composed of a different class from the House, which is elected by communities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or localities. The former may be said to represent capital; the latter, labor. Each holds a check upon the other, so that, between the extreme views and wishes of the two, legislation is necessarily tinged with conservatism, and hence safety. It may be that the result represents only a compromise, but the medium in the political as well as in the intellectual world is always the safest. The executive is also a check on the legislative branch. It is not superior, because laws may be enacted even without the consent of the executive. The keystone in the arch is, however, to be found in the judicial branch, which neither originates nor enforces the laws, but which construes the acts of both the other branches in the light of constitutional authority, and without which the other two would, possibly, fall into a conflict as to their respective rights and powers. Our States have corresponding branches. Cities, however, at best have only two of the three branches—that is, the executive and legislative. The keystone of the arch is missing. Hence the struggles for supremacy between the other two branches. Hence the unseemly and oftentimes injurious conflicts between the two, always the result of a grasping for more power by the one or the other, or a trenching of one branch upon the prerogatives of the other. There is no judiciary to curb and restrain and define the powers and the duties of each to the other. The courts of the State must needs, therefore, be appealed to in such cases, and this is almost always resented as the introduction of a foreign element into the controversy.

The government of St. Louis is as nearly perfect as that of any city in the United States, and yet, while it is modelled upon the theory and plan of our federal and State governments, and has the executive and legislative branches, with the veto power in the former, and the division of the latter into a higher, select, and smaller body, and a lower, larger, and more essentially representative body, and while the concurrence of both branches of the legislative and that of the executive are necessary to the enacting of any law, except that the legislative can overrule the executive veto by the necessary vote, still the judicial branch is wanting, and the result is that from time to time the other two branches have encroached upon the powers or prerogatives of each other, or, in attempting to do so, have created "deadlocks," which necessarily impair the efficiency of the public service. In St.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Louis there are further checks for the preservation of the rights of the people, which also render frauds and dishonesty in public office almost impossible without being speedily detected. Thus the comptroller is the fiscal officer, and his approval is necessary to all expenditures. The auditor sees that no money is spent unless there has been an appropriation for the purpose. The treasurer cannot pay out a cent unless ordered by both the comptroller and auditor. These are elected officers, heavily bonded and directly responsible to the people. No financial difficulties or shortages can occur without the connivance of all three. In addition, there is another check upon the reckless or extravagant appropriation or expenditure of public money for street purposes, in the fact that the legislative branch cannot pass an ordinance for such purposes unless it is recommended by the board of public improvements, which is composed of five members appointed by the mayor, and a president who is elected by a direct vote of the people.

The charter of this city was adopted in pursuance of a constitutional grant of the power given to it to have a board of fifteen freeholders propose a charter to the people of the city for their adoption, which should, when adopted, be the organic law of the city. The instrument was most carefully prepared by eminent citizens, many of them of national reputation, and while it is necessarily defective in respect to the absence of the judicial branch, it is nevertheless confidently believed to be the best city charter in the land. In fact, it has in fifteen years' experience proved so satisfactory that it has been embodied almost literally in the statutes of this State as the law for the government of all cities having a population of over 100,000 inhabitants, and its principal features have been adopted for the government of all cities, towns, and villages, however small.

The chief difficulty that has so far been experienced is in the requirement that all appointments of the executive shall be confirmed by the council (or upper branch of the legislative power). It has occurred that the members of the council have attempted to use the confirming power to coerce the discretion or prerogative of the executive as to whom he shall appoint, by refusing to confirm his nominee because they thought some one else ought to be appointed. This has caused temporary inconvenience, annoyance, and injury to the public service; but such unlawful assump-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of authority, such flagrant abuse of the confirming power, has happily been of rare occurrence, and has always been rebuked by the people at the next election, and the persons so abusing their trust have been promptly relegated to private life.

All governments necessarily curtail the natural rights of man. The protection they afford to life and property compensates fully for the deprivation, impairment, or curtailment of such natural rights. Urban communities need more government and sterner rule than country districts. The former need a head, who is always on duty, with full power to preserve the peace and protect the weak. The latter are sufficiently protected by the character of the people, the want of attraction to the lawless classes, and the general laws of the State to be enforced by the courts. Hence the executive of a city is a peace officer of the community. The legislative branch cannot always be in session. So its powers should be limited to prescribing laws for the punishment of offenders against the peace, health, morality, and good government of the body corporate. As the executive is always on duty and generally busy, his powers should be large and liberally construed, and he should be in fact, as well as in name, the chief officer of the municipality. The business of any other branch should be to aid him, support him, and advise with him, and it should be left to the courts or the people to punish him for excesses or abuses of authority. To enable him properly and harmoniously to carry out the principles of local rule, he should be allowed to select his staff of assistants. His choice should only be restrained or overruled where he has plainly violated the American idea of honesty, fidelity, and fitness in selecting his aids.

As governments are necessary for protection, and as taxes can only be justified on the theory of protection, so the plan of a city government should be to give to the person specially charged with the duty of protecting the citizens all needed powers, while the expenditure of the people's money, which should be done with deliberation, ought to be left to the legislative, or, properly, the business, portion of the government.

We frequently hear that politics should have no place in municipal affairs. Politics, properly understood, means only the science of government—the regulation and government of the State, the preservation of its safety, peace, and prosperity, the protection of its citizens in their rights, with the preservation and improvement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their morals. If these are objects worthy of national interest, why are they not equally desirable of attainment and observance in local matters? To achieve them is the purpose of all governments, national, State, and local. For such purposes alone taxes are levied. How to accomplish such beneficial results is a question of as much concern, proportionately, in local matters as it is in national. The protection of the people, and the expenditure of the people's money to secure that protection, are the sole object and purpose of both. If the wisdom of our forefathers and the experience of over a century have satisfied us that these ends can only be attained by the fundamental doctrine of a division of powers in the nation, why does not the same hold good in municipal governments? In St. Louis it has been tried and it is confidently believed that with a very few modifications, which experience and time will accomplish, the problem of the government of cities has been solved in its present charter.

EDWARD A. NOONAN,
Mayor of St. Louis.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT AMERICANS CAN DO FOR RUSSIA.

BY SERGIUS STEPNIAK.

I WANT to tell you a story—the story of a dream, which I may call the dream of my life. It was nine years ago, in Italy, that it took hold of me, and since then my life has been a chase after this dream.

I wrote several books, and I had the rare good fortune to see some trace of their influence upon the views of the thoughtful men of our time. But had these books marked an epoch in literature, I should not care for it half so much as for one step toward the realization of my dream. When I speak of it, people smile and tell me that "it is only a dream." May be. Sometimes I think so myself. But that does not diminish my desire to gain converts to it. All great things have had an element of dream behind them. The world is—I will not say for dreamers, but—for those to whom the dreamers have given it. There is a strange power in a dream which nothing else can impart. A dream is an idea impersonated, poetized, throbbing with life and enthusiasm. It engrosses the whole of a man—mind, heart, and soul; it stirs up his emotional nature and concentrates all his faculties upon one single object. That is what I have experienced, and wish others to experience too.

In telling my story I shall be personal sometimes, and I do not know whether I should apologize for this. I have found that personal things interest people most, and I wish some one to be interested in, possibly to take some hints from, these pages.

But what is this dream of mine?

This dream is to see one day a new crusade started in the West against the great sinner of the East, the Russian Tzardom; to see an army spring into existence—not a host, but a well-selected army like that of Gideon—composed of the best men of all free nations, with unlimited means at their command, making common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause with the Russian patriots, fighting side by side with them, each with their appropriate weapons, until that nightmare of modern times, the Russian autocracy, is conquered, and compelled to accept the supremacy of the triumphant democracy.

This is truly a "dream," if not a chimera! the reader will say.

I warned him that so it is. But all dreams, even those which are apparently most incoherent and absurd, have their origin in the realities of life. Mine is no exception, and springs from the natural and, for a Russian, legitimate desire to find some compensation for the special difficulties which surround our struggle for freedom.

Of greater material difficulties I will not speak. Being the last to rebel, we have to face a government which has taken advantage of all the wonders of modern technical invention, as well as of the improvement in the material part of culture, and is far better equipped for fight and resistance than any previous tyranny.

I will not dwell upon the effect of the general character of our country—enormous distances, predominance of agricultural population, smallness of towns, and the like. All this is self-evident.

I prefer to speak here about a circumstance of apparently small importance, but in reality of great moment. In our hard struggle, the soothing, inspiring, and invigorating dream element has been cruelly spoiled for us by fate, or at least awarded with peculiar miserliness.

The English, who were the first to rebel against absolutism and win political freedom, were in this respect the most favored people in the world. Theirs was a political revolution carried on upon a religious basis. They were firmly persuaded that they were fighting for men's happiness, both in this world and in the future What a scope for noble and exalted dreams in those good Roundheads! Certainly they were the best-cared-for children in the revolutionary family, as the first-born are with the chosen people of Israel.

The French, who followed suit a century later, had their inheritance of dreamland diminished by half. Still, they had no reason to complain, for their share was large enough. Political freedom—Liberty—was for them but a third sister of two other goddesses, Equality and Fraternity. What more would the world need to become an earthly paradise if it had all these three?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But there is no way of dreaming about things which have already become a part of reality. Dreams thrive in the twilight of glimmering hope. The crude prosaic light of day takes off their evanescent glory. The nineteenth century holds fast to political rights and representative government, improving and developing them further, but no longer idealizes them.

Dreams have not forsaken this generation, which, on the contrary, is perhaps the most given to dreams, and therefore the most fervid and impetuous, that history records. But they have fled from modern council chambers as the beautiful native birds of America have fled from the bustle and noise of towns to the woods of the far West. Dreams are hovering now over the new land which the keen-sighted men of our time have already discerned on the horizon—the land of the future coöperative civilization, the promised land of the present competitive, pugnacious, man-a-wolf-to-man civilization.

But those glorious dreams, which are like beacons lighting the high road of progress for advanced nations, were for us Russians like will-o'-the-wisps, which led us astray from the path marked out for us by inexorable history, and caused—for a time at least—deplorable disunions and still more deplorable losses. A whole generation—the best that has ever been born to Russia—was sacrificed before we learned the simple truth that the cart must not be put before the horse, or, in other words, that the social order cannot be changed before people have the means to change it. No country had to pay so dearly for such an elementary doctrine.

We learned at last to postpone our personal inclinations to the needs of the country, and, leaving the future to the future, we accepted for the present the great and modest mission which history has laid upon our generation—the political enfranchisement of the country, the obtaining for Russia of those elementary guarantees of civil freedom and constitutional government which all the nations of Europe already possess.

What can be less romantic and dreamy at the time we live in? Yet we fought, and I dare say fought valiantly, finding our inspiration in love to our country and in faith in the Russian people.

It was a fierce, terribly unequal struggle, which, with the reader's permission, I can compare only to that of the Spartans of Leonidas against the hordes of Xerxes. The whole power of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mighty empire was arraigned against the small body of revolutionists, who were able to make face against such overwhelming power only thanks to their boundless self-sacrifice and devotion. They struggled as long as they had breath, and they fell almost to a man. As I pass in memory all these friends and companions of mine, I find that two-thirds of them are already dead, some upon the scaffold, some others in prison; the remaining third pining away in the Siberian mines or in the dungeons, waiting for death to release them; only a handful, seven or eight, having escaped the common doom and being now in the lands of the free—one after five, another after ten, the third after fifteen years of prison and sufferings. I think I am the only one who escaped almost scathless—a privilege that needs apology.

I shall be permitted, I hope, without infringing the rules of modesty, to say that this is due, not to my lagging behind, but to my good luck and also to my dream.

In Russia, when a revolutionist gets into trouble with the police, the usual expedient is to change identity and settle in a new place. But after a while this expedient no longer suffices. Then the man will sometimes get smuggled across the frontier and have an "airing" abroad.

I left Russia and returned in this way three times. In 1882 I was taking my "airing" in Italy, and was in correspondence with my St. Petersburg friends about my return to Russia, which I had every reason to believe would be my last. It was the epoch when absolutism and revolution, both having sustained severe blows, were straining their forces in the attempt at mutual destruction. It was impossible to survive long in such a fierce struggle, and one does not come from so far for a short visit.

But whilst the preparations for my return were going on, something unexpected occurred: I wrote a little book—my "Underground Russia," which appeared originally in Italian. From the very outset it was evident that this little volume had made what is called a hit—had won a good prize in the literary lottery. Hitherto our publications were addressed to a special public—to our revolutionary congregation, I should say. This was the first time that the Russian revolution addressed the world at large, and the question dawned upon me whether it would not be the right thing to do to improve the opportunity.

We were struggling for freedom, which all the civilized na-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions already enjoy. It was right that the free nations should extend a friendly hand to us: were we not following in the way they have tempted us into by their example? Besides, does not the Russian autocrat receive from foreign countries all assistance, both material and moral, in maintaining tyranny? Some of the foreign governments, indeed, go so far as to actually help him in hunting down his rebellious subjects. If the Tzar is helped so energetically by the selfish and reactionary elements of civilization, it is only fair that we should get from the liberty-loving people that support which they can reasonably give.

The thing was right and just, and seemed to me very easily attainable. If the world so awfully misjudged us, it was due entirely to the fact that free scope was allowed to our enemies in calumniating us. We had only to tell the truth, and nothing but truth, about our party and our people, and all would be changed.

It was then that the dream I have mentioned took hold of me.

To conquer the world for the Russian revolution; to throw upon the scales the huge weight of the public opinion of civilized nations; to bring to those whose struggle is so hard that unexpected help; to find without a lever to move the minds of the Russians themselves within—this was the dream which glistened before me.

The opportunity was unique.

Was it worth while to withdraw from the ranks of the combatants one active member and make a writer of him?

I answered the question in the affirmative, and remained abroad permanently.

In my moments of despondency, which others may call moments of lucidity, whilst thinking of the little which I have done, I question the wisdom of my resolution. But I have never repented of it. All my companions whose memory I cherish would in my place have decided it in the same way.

I have not conquered the world for the Russian revolution. I hardly need say that. What I have succeeded in doing was to make in it a small place for myself. But this was not, indeed, the object of my endeavors. When I think of my present life, of the undisturbed pleasure of my literary pursuits, and of the friendship of so many good, generous men and women, which alone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would suffice to exalt and brighten a man's existence, and when I compare my life with the fate of those with whom I expected to share everything,—well, I cannot help feeling something very different from pleasure.

But whilst I was hammering away at my little anvil with an energy due in great part to my dream, which was always receding, sometimes growing dim, but never disappearing from my horizon, two events of really world-wide importance occurred to revive my hopes and render some attempts at their realization possible.

These two events were, first, the great success of Russian novelists, and, second, the appearance of Mr. George Kennan's articles.

It is not by hatred to the Russian autocracy, but by sympathy with the Russian people, that foreigners have been moved to side with the cause of Russian freedom. There are many governments in Asia and Africa which are even worse than the Russian. Yet who cares about that? If people feel differently with regard to Russia, it is because Russia has ceased to be a mere geographical expression for them. They have got to know something of the Russians as living men and women, and that is the only reason why they can assimilate themselves with the Russians and sympathize with them.

Now, there is certainly nothing which can give such an insight into Russian life and character as the work of our great novelists. They do not describe—they give the living life such as it is; and the crowd of Russian men and women whom they present in spirit, with the completeness and reality of which great artists alone have the secret, have familiarized the world with Russia more than any amount of study or travelling could do. Turgueneff, Tolstoï, Dostoëvsky, have prepared the ground for all that is sympathetic with Russia of the Russians, as distinguished from official Russia.

Mr. George Kennan deals directly with the Russian political question, taking it also from its humane side. It is by presenting the living men and women who are the "victims" of Russian despotism, by showing human tears which are shed and blood which flows, that he called forth throughout all the world an outcry against Russian tyranny.

Of the historical importance of his work I need not speak. From the time of the publication of his articles the Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question has held a conspicuous and peculiar place in the thoughts and feelings of modern humanity.

But the Russian question has for the world more than a sentimental interest. The destinies of a state numbering over a hundred and ten million inhabitants must necessarily affect, for good or for evil, the destinies of its neighbors. The fate of Europe will be changed if autocracy is abolished in Russia. Independently of temporary excitement about her, Russia will always attract much attention on the part of those who take interest in the general progress of humanity. She is the youngest in the family of civilized nations, but she has already shown what potentialities are hidden within her. Russia is a country with a great future, and the romance and poetry of great expectations are adding powerfully to the attraction which she exercises.

The total amount of intelligent interest and sympathy which the Russian cause has excited in the world at large is undoubtedly very great; and, on the whole, it will undoubtedly increase as Russia becomes better known, as her interior convulsions become more apparent, and as the rapid progress of nations all the world over makes the contrast between Russian régime and theirs more shocking.

The question is how to utilize that powerful current of thoughts and emotions to the best advantage of the country which has excited them.

My trip through the States, however short, was sufficient to convince me that there are thousands and thousands of Americans who would wish for nothing better. But how to do it—that is the point.

Ours is a domestic feud. There is no foreign power to uphold tyranny in Russia, as was the case with Italy, Greece, and Hungary. This puts direct assistance on the part of sympathetic foreigners entirely out of the question. The Russians must fight their own battle as best they can. Even diplomatic interference, which has been suggested by some of our friends, seems to me not advisable, except in the Jewish question, which is a peculiar one, the position of Jews in Russia being strictly analogous to that of the Bulgarians and other Christian populations under the Turkish yoke. With regard to the Russian question in general, it is to public opinion pure and simple, and nothing but public opinion, that we appeal. No American will deny our right to ask

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for such support, or his countrymen's right to give it to us. But there are very few who will not doubt in their hearts whether such support is worth much for the Russian.

During my journey through the States I had to speak upon this subject with several hundreds of people, and I remember only one man—it was Colonel Robert Ingersoll—who stopped me at the beginning of my explanations and himself told me all the arguments I had in store for proving the great value of foreign agitation. Others, who seemed to admit this on general grounds, were still curious to hear how the thing can be applied to Russia in particular.

But in nine cases out of ten we had to go through regular debates, which were remarkably uniform. The inquirer started, as a rule, from the supposition that the object of the agitation is to reach the Tzar and to give him correct information about his country. This was certainly very *naïve*, and, for a Russian, an amusing way of regarding our efforts. But if my American friends should be offended by my remark, I may console them by saying that the English were just as bad.

It was very natural in both cases. In America, as well as in England, the government is a sort of registering office shaping into laws what public opinion bids. But in Russia we have still to get such a government. At present we have one that knowingly and deliberately resists native public opinion, taking advantage of the fact that material force is still in its hands. It may happen, and it has happened several times, that foreign disapprobation has induced the Russian government to take steps which native public opinion could have never enforced: this is the usual way with despots. But it would be absurd to depend upon such influence. For us, foreign agitation has a value of its own. It is a new weapon in the struggle. Russia, as a state, depends in many ways upon the support of foreign countries. By creating abroad a stream of public feeling hostile to the present government in Russia, we weaken its position as much as by withdrawing a part of its support at home. This is perfectly well understood by the present rulers of Russia. Although always short of cash, the Russian Government spares no expense to keep foreign public opinion on its side. A number of official papers (such as *Le Nord* and *Le Gaulois*) are maintained; all the papers that can be corrupted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are corrupted. The London *Times* and *Daily Telegraph* have informed their readers that the sum of about half a million dollars was assigned in 1890 for this laudable purpose. What better proof could there be of the value of foreign public opinion ?

Besides, the great increase of the cosmopolitan or international element in the intellectual life of the educated people of modern times, especially in Russia, makes foreign agitation a powerful, though indirect, means to stir up public opinion within Russia herself.

I remember that whenever I mentioned this point to Americans they invariably expressed great surprise. It was wonderful enough that the Russians should be affected by what distant foreigners think and say about them, but it seemed to them still more surprising that Russians should know so much about it, for they guessed that papers containing anything unfavorable to the Russian government would hardly be allowed to have free circulation in the empire of the Tzar.

I had to explain that, besides the usual open system of spreading literature which Americans know, there is a system of clandestine circulation unknown to them, but working very well in Russia. Anything that is of great interest to the public is sure to be smuggled, one way or another, in a limited number of copies into Russia. Here the thing is immediately translated into Russian and lithographed or hectographed in hundreds of copies, each copy having hundreds of readers. They are not thrown away or stored up in libraries : they are too precious for the one and too dangerous for the other. They pass from hand to hand until they are worn to rags, and those of their temporary owners who unite sociability with courage will privately assemble their friends in parties of ten, fifteen, or more, and read the interesting thing aloud to them. No more pleasant and "high-class" entertainment can be given in Russia. No work has been so strictly tabooed by the Russian censorship as Mr. George Kennan's articles in *The Century*, and nevertheless there is hardly a man or woman interested in politics who has not read them. The same may be said of some other publications.

News of importance is transmitted from mouth to mouth, and spreads rapidly all over the country. In the summer of 1890 Mr. Smith, a Gladstonian, asked a question in Parliament about the Siberian atrocities. Two months later I received from a friend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

living in a small provincial town in the heart of Russia a letter asking me whether it was true that *Mr. Gladstone* asked a question in Parliament upon these atrocities. The news had reached the province quickly enough, though becoming a little magnified by transmission.

Sometimes news of peculiar piquancy is spread openly through the papers published under the censorship, by means of virulent and abusive articles purporting to denounce the thing in question. The public, being used to this, leaves the husk and takes the kernel.

It cannot be expected that anything written by foreigners or for foreigners should tell to the bulk of Russians anything which they did not know already from their own experience or observation. But in all cases what stirs up the Russians so deeply is the fact that there has been interest taken and sympathy expressed for their cause among those nations which the Russians are wont to consider their elders in civilization and freedom. Our people respect to a fault foreign public opinion. Foreign agitation becomes, therefore, to some extent, a substitute for a broader agitation upon the Russian soil, which is impossible under our present political conditions. It is a real power, a source of actual help in our struggle for freedom.

But how can it be carried out? There are many means of influencing and expressing public opinion in free countries—the press, public meetings and demonstrations, protests, and petitions. All these have been employed in the interest of the Russian cause, and all are good in their way. I do not want to impose my views upon any one. If I have some bias against petitioning, it is simply on account of the petitioners themselves. It seems to me a pity that so many good, refined, high-minded men and women should address in deferential terms a man who has connived at and ordered the flogging of women, and other outrages which ought to have excluded him from the companionship of decent people.

Public demonstrations and meetings, if of imposing character, are very valuable in certain exceptional circumstances, and they have the advantage of being noticed, like all public events, in the Russian press—it matters little with what comments.

But our real battering-ram is undoubtedly the press, which is the least obtrusive, the most unimpeachable, and at the same time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most effective of the weapons we have at our disposal—the daily press in particular, which is the greatest power of modern times.

We have to deal with facts. The influence of our work depends wholly upon the amount of authentic information upon Russian things we put in circulation. Blame receives its poignancy, and sympathy its full effect, when known to be based not upon vague generalities, but upon concrete, authentic, and numerous facts, which have been exposed in all details and open to the test of controversial examination. All this we get by means of the daily press, which has, moreover, the inestimable advantage of telling things whilst they are fresh and recent, and not after they have been covered with the rust of time.

We do not want to flood the daily press with Russian affairs; this would be bad policy, even if it were in our power to inflict such an inundation upon the reading public. The amount of attention and room given to Russian affairs by the American and English press seems to us amply sufficient. It is the quality of the information that must be improved—its importance and authenticity.

Now, as the only means of getting into permanent communication with modern journalism is to enter into its confraternity, the idea of a newspaper devoted to the Russian cause abroad came naturally to the front.

Such a paper was actually started in England in June, 1890, under the auspices of the English Friends of Russian Freedom, a society headed by a committee of thirty-seven members, including nine members of Parliament, ministers of all denominations, and some of the most influential men and women in England.

Dr. R. Spence Watson, Bensham Grove, Gateshead on Tyne, the chairman of the Liberal Association of Great Britain, is the founder and president of this society; Edward R. Pease (Hyde Park Mansions, London) is its secretary.

The paper is *Free Russia*, published simultaneously in London and New York (51 *Tribune* Building).

In April last a society similar to the English one was founded in Boston on the initiative of Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Colonel T. W. Higginson, Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain), and William Lloyd Garrison. In a few weeks it received the adhesion of a number of persons, among whom were men of such eminence as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John G. Whittier, James Russell Lowell, Phillips Brooks, F. D. Huntington, Lyman Abbott, and many others, without speaking of Mr. George Kennan, who was one of the first to join the society and who has promised his full and hearty support. Mr. Francis Garrison, of Boston (4 Park Street), is its treasurer; Mr. Spring is its secretary.

From the reception which the movement met with in New York and other important cities, it is easy to foresee that the new society promises to become within a short time a national one, with scores of branches in all the principal cities of the States.

It is quite possible that at the next anniversary of the London society a new society of the same nature may be organized in Germany, then in Austria, Italy, and—at the first clearing of the political horizon from the mist of Russian alliance—in France.

This course is the right one, and the beginning is excellent. The existence of such a paper and of such a league of eminent men, many of whom are known and respected in Russia, will constitute an impressive and permanent demonstration in favor of Russia's freedom. But I wish some one would look beyond the immediate issue, and see, behind the paper, the vast movement of which it must be the interpreter.

A special paper devoted to Russian interests can never command more than a few thousand subscribers. Its influence will be certainly much greater than the mere number of its subscribers may suggest. But to become a real power in the struggle, to become a source from which papers commanding millions of readers will draw their information, this paper must have means exceeding those it can get by ordinary subscription. We can avail ourselves now only of information obtained gratuitously, or almost gratuitously. But there is much more which could be taken advantage of. Every press man knows what a well-organized bureau of correspondents can do.

The society which stands behind the paper is, therefore, more important than the paper. The paper is the tool, a pick-axe, very well adapted for excavating the truth, but the society is the hand holding this tool, and the amount of useful work depends upon the strength of the hand.

There is a law of equivalents and of conservation of energy in social life, as well as in mechanics. The light which has been thrown upon Russia's inner conditions has generated sympathy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This sympathy can be again converted into light, which will be the exact equivalent of the material means spent upon it.

Hitherto we have been able to throw into the outer darkness of the Russian empire a few burning torches, so to speak, which have lit up a certain piece of ground, showing the monsters hidden there. This has not been entirely useless. But we could do much more. In modern warfare artificial lights have been used to light up the enemy's camps by night, the light from a powerful source being thrown to a distance by means of big reflectors. It seems to me that the American and English friends of Russian freedom can do, if they choose, something analogous with regard to the Russian autocracy. By combining our efforts we could break the darkness in which its deeds are wrapped, and keep upon it permanently the glowing, all-pervading light of publicity.

Will the Americans or the English care to do this?

I do not know. I only know that there is a way to effectively help the Russians, and I have shown it.

Many times I have heard Americans say that they consider it a sacred duty of the free nations to help those who are still struggling for their freedom. I am certainly the last man to contradict such a doctrine. But there are duties so lofty that their fulfilment can be hoped for, but never claimed.

We are prepared for everything. If there is no hope of advancing the cause of freedom in Russia otherwise than through rivers of blood and over the corpses of Russia's most devoted children, we will accept this too. But looking upon the matter as objectively as I possibly can, it seems to me that there is no foundation for so gloomy a view.

There is no cause involving any humanitarian interest which has not thriven in our generous age, and the cause of Russia is the cause of one hundred and ten millions of men, who all suffer in their different ways—peasants and Jews, educated people and ignorant. No cause is greater and more deeply ingrained in the thought and feeling of modern humanity.

The idea of the brotherhood of nations is no longer a dream of a few idealists. It is one of the realities of modern life and the foundation of our hopes. Nations are united much more closely nowadays than they were fifty, or even twenty-five, years ago. Everywhere I have happened to pass I have met numbers of American men and women to whom the sufferings of Siberian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exiles and prisoners, and the horrors of which they constantly hear from distant Russia, have been the source of mental pain as deep and real as if caused by something happening at their doors. There are thousands who feel thus in the towns and cities of the States. They could start a movement which, by its usefulness, magnitude, and character, would be the glory of the enlightened century which renders it possible. They would certainly start such a movement *if only they could believe* that their efforts would be, not a waste of energy, not mere sentimental outpourings, but a real work for Russian enfranchisement, a real means of strengthening the party of freedom and weakening the party of despotism.

This seems to me the gist of the question. There is no limit to the extensions of our work and of the good that can be done if people only come to believe in it.

Now, this belief can be imparted if there are a few men or women who will study the matter carefully, with minds unprejudiced by its apparent unwontedness, and themselves come to believe in a plan which, for the sake of practical people, I will still call a dream.

S. STEPNIAK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBTS.

BY THE HON. ROBERT P. PORTER, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ELEVENTH CENSUS.

IT HAS cost nearly a million dollars thus far to collect the statistics of mortgage indebtedness of individuals and private corporations throughout the United States. That seems like a large sum of money, but it will take, as I informed the committees of both houses of Congress, when the matter was up for consideration, at least another half-million dollars to finish the work.

Did Congress act wisely in appropriating a million dollars to carry on this investigation, especially when the committees were informed at the time that certainly half a million more, and possibly another million, would be required for the investigation? It was not a hesitating act. Both parties voted for it. In the Senate, I believe, but four votes were cast against the bill, and in the House of Representatives not over twenty-five negative votes were recorded. It was a novel, not to say a bold, step in statistical inquiry. Old statisticians shook their heads, and said the obstacles in the way of such an investigation were too great to overcome. All over the country could be heard murmurings of discontent and declarations that the people of the United States would never submit to such an inquisitorial inquiry pertaining to their private affairs. Partisan newspapers made this investigation, forced upon the Census Office, in spite of repeated protests, by an almost unanimous vote in both houses, an excuse for malicious attacks upon the whole census, and called upon the people to resist the enumerators, if necessary, with force.

Meantime the Superintendent of Census was sorely perplexed. This novel inquiry had been ordered on the very eve of sending out the population schedules. Those schedules were complete, and the public printer was ready to start the printing of 25,000,000,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the probable number required. No time could be lost. To put questions in the population schedule asking every individual in the United States the amount of the mortgage on his farm or home, the motive for contracting the debt, and the value of his property, would have swamped the constitutional enumeration of the people. The amount of irritation which would have been aroused, had this course been adopted, cannot be estimated. The enumeration of the people would have been endangered, and for no purpose, because, in the very nature of things, the enumerators would have failed in half the cases to obtain the desired information about mortgages.

The accepted theory of the census is that the enumerators see personally about one in every seven of the inhabitants. Already the population schedule of the census was bowed down with the burden of a double yoke. There were twice as many questions as should have been propounded before those relating to mortgages were added. These questions, however, were made as easy as possible by throwing out all reference to the amount of indebtedness, interest, value of property, etc., and confining them to a simple inquiry as to whether the farm or home was owned or rented, and, if owned, whether free from debt or encumbered by a mortgage. If unable to ascertain whether a home was mortgaged or not, the enumerator was instructed to give the full name and address of the owner, and in subsequent correspondence the Census Office assumed that the property was mortgaged until otherwise informed. This solution proved a practical one, and has formed the basis of one of the most valuable and interesting investigations ever undertaken by any government.

While the addition of these and other questions, such as those relating to the veterans of the late war, increased the cost and added to the difficulties of the constitutional enumeration, and while my individual voice will always be raised against thus overloading the population schedule with special inquiries, I am satisfied that, owing to the high character of the supervisors and the faithfulness and intelligence of the vast body of enumerators, the enumeration of the people did not suffer to any serious extent. At the same time, Congress should in future legislation simplify the population schedule, and relegate all questions relating to special inquiries to other schedules,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be subsequently filled out by special agents or by enumerators employed by the day.

And now a word as to the cost, magnitude, and results of this stupendous inquiry into individual indebtedness and the debt of private corporations throughout the United States. One million and a half dollars seems a great deal of money, but when the field of inquiry is only limited by the boundary of this vast domain of ours; when every one of the nine million mortgages placed on record during the ten years ended December 31, 1889, has to be examined and transcribed to slips; when circular requests have to be addressed and mailed, numbering three millions and a half; when all raw material has to be digested in the Census Office and arranged for the volumes,—when, as I say, this is all considered, a million and a half dollars is not such an imposing sum of money.

Nor can the benefits of this expenditure be gauged by the statistical or scientific test alone. Though at first doubtful as to the expediency of the investigation, fearful that it would endanger the enumeration, and opposed to adding it to a census overloaded with special inquiries, the results have compelled me to regard the work of the farms, homes, and mortgages division of the Census Office as of more direct and immediate value to the country than all the rest of the census put together. A successful business man must keep an eye alike on the profit and the loss side of his ledger. He must be acquainted with what goes out as well as with what comes in. No nation is so prosperous that it can afford to ignore its debts, whether national, State, municipal, corporate, or individual. The first step towards paying a debt is to ascertain its exact amount. The next step is to ascertain the productive powers of the man or nation.

As a student of public debts, I find that in the United States we have our debt-creating as well as our debt-paying periods. Without discussing the national debt, which was largely a war debt, the history of State, county, municipal, and even township debts in the United States shows that we have repeatedly had almost crazes of going into debt; and they have been followed by periods of retrenchment and of debt-paying. There are people now living who will recall the enormous sums of money voted by States for all sorts of internal improvements far in advance of the requirements of population, beginning in 1830 and continuing for seven years—a most extraordinary finan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cial period. Under these State debts, which seemed to reach their culminating point in 1842, the strongest States of the Union staggered, and some of the most solvent of our Northern States were on the verge of bankruptcy. Another attack of debt-creating fever came after the war, and extended to counties in the Western States and municipalities in the East. Counties voted money for railroads, and cities for any kind of improvements, with a prodigality somewhat in proportion to the ease with which the money was at first obtained. With the crash of 1873 came the accounting time, and a period of debt adjusting and paying. The census of 1890 will show a great reduction in the per capita of public debt and a sound financial condition of State and local finance throughout the country.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE TOTAL AND PER-CAPITA INDEBTEDNESS OF THE UNITED STATES, LESS SINKING-FUNDS, FOR 1870, 1880, and 1890.

Character of debt.	Amount of debt less sinking-funds.			Per-capita debt less sinking-funds.		
	1870.	1880.	1890.	1870.	1880.	1890.
Totals	$3,275,239,131	$3,045,796,010	$2,019,735,796	$84.94	$60.73	$32.25
United States (national)	2,406,562,373	1,922,517,364	891,960,104	62.41	38.33	14.24
States, Territories, and District of Columbia	35 2,866,698	297,244,094	228,997,385	9.15	5.93	3 66
Counties	187,565,540	124,105,027	141,950,845	4.86	2.47	2.27
Municipalities	271,119,668	684,348,843	b 719,068,656	7.03	13.64	11.48
School Districts	57,124,852	17,580,682	c 37,758,806	1.48	.35	.60

b. Subject to revision, 59 small places delinquent.
c. Idaho not included.

Especially note the decline in State debts in the above exhibit. In round figures, it may be said the per-capita State debt has gone from nine dollars in 1870 to six dollars in 1880, and finally to three dollars at the present time. Municipal indebtedness seems to have reached its highest point in 1880, and this is in keeping with the known facts. Between 1870 and 1877 municipalities were seized with a debt-creating fever the like of which had never been observed in this country before or since. The result was that the per-capita debt doubled between 1870 and 1880. From $271,000,000 to $684,000,000 is a tremendous jump, and this during a decade in which the city population only increased from 8,071,875 to 11,318,547. During the last decade, which has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of municipal debt-paying and retrenchment, the increase was only from $684,000,000 to $719,000,000, while the city population went from 11,318,547 to 18,235,670. The per-capita debt has decreased. The crisis in county debt-creating was reached, as the above table shows, in 1870. The per-capita county debt dropped from $4.86 in 1870 to $2.47 in 1880, and a slight decrease is noted again in 1890.

One of the ablest articles ever written on the subject of public debt was by Benjamin R. Curtis, published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1844. This eminent jurist rightly contended, in commenting on the then existing State debt, that great injustice must be done to the people of this country if the general state of men's minds and of financial affairs is left out of view in considering the subject of their indebtedness. "They have been rash," he said, "but it was at a time when rashness was epidemic; they have been improvident, but it was when prudence was generally considered little better than narrow-minded timidity; their fault may have been very great, but it was very general, and it was a fault of which the creditor largely partook with the debtor. It was rash and improvident in them to borrow, but it was rash and improvident in others to lend, for in those cases the lenders had almost as good means of knowing the grounds of credit as the borrowers had."

What is true of public debt is equally true of private debt. Public agitation of the subject, sound discussion, a careful enumeration of the motives, an inventory of the productive power available to pay it, and a careful accounting of the amount and the date of its maturity, will as surely stem the tide of individual indebtedness as it has done the frenzy of public debt-creating. From the day the special agents of the Census Office started to overhaul the records of every recorder's office in every county, city, and town, the enumerators began to ask questions at the door of every farmhouse and home, and the Census Office commenced to send its individual debt schedules through the mails, the epoch of the last debt-creating mania was over, and a period of accounting, and earnest endeavor to face and overcome the danger, dawned.

From a statistical standpoint the work of collecting information in regard to mortgage indebtedness has been prosecuted with a success far beyond the anticipation of statisticians who have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studied the question for years. At the present writing it is impossible to estimate the full benefits which will be derived from such an investigation. The employment of a small army of 2,500 special agents and clerks to make an abstract of every mortgage placed on record throughout the United States for the last ten years has attracted attention to the danger of these encumbrances, to the enormous burdens in the way of interest, to the alarming extent to which usury is practised, and to the defectiveness of these records in all parts of the country. The agents of the Census Office have, as I have said, overhauled the records in every State and territory. They have travelled on horseback and on foot through the most sparsely-settled districts of our vast domain in search of mortgages, and have done their work so industriously and so thoroughly that we now have on file in Washington, as a result of their labor, the abstracts of about nine million mortgages. Some months before the inquiry was begun, Congress, and through Congress the public, were put in possession of the scope of the plan adopted. That plan, with hardly any change, has been successfully carried out. It comprised two distinct methods; one having the local records for the basis of operation, the other the population schedule, and hence the individual. The following table summarizes the results of this inquiry as far as possible to date:

	Alabama.	Iowa.	Kansas.	Tennessee.	Illinois.
Mortgages recorded, number	93,828	497,710	620,049	93,282	609,251
1880–1889, amount	$91,099,623	$431,288,542	$482,699,640	$100,212,257	$870,182,120
Mortgages in force, number	35,331	249,030	288,286	39,470	294,174
Jan. 1, 1890, amount	$39,027,983	$199,031,956	$235,485,108	$40,421,396	$384,299,620
Percentages of debt recorded 1880-89; in force Jan. 1, 1890	42.84	46.15	48.79	40.34	44.14
Number of acres and lots, acres	6,008,636	16,206,354	25,143,803	3,035,816	10,751,246
Encumbered Jan. 1, 1890, lots	14,213	160,550	263,197	32,957	168,247
Number of acres and lots, acres	16,175,153	32,627,928	53,763,190	7,269,279	21,447,578
Mortgaged 1880-89, lots.	34,649	292,097	530,865	65,566	602,000
Percentage of assessed acres encumbered Jan. 1, 1890	21.67	46.66	58.24	11.72	31.04
Equated life of mortgage (in years)	2.73	4.93	3.32	2.81	4.02
Range of interest rates (per cent.)	1-40	1-20	1-60	1-12	1-18
Amount per capita of mortgages in force Jan. 1, 1890	$26	$104	$165	$23	$100

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The two important features brought out in the above table are the amount of mortgages placed on record each year for ten years, and the amount of the existing debt. The reader will readily understand that it would be absurd to accept the amount of the uncancelled mortgages as the amount of debt in force. Such an exhibit would manifestly be a gross exaggeration unworthy of confidence. The extent of this defect in the records has been ascertained by the Census Office in one hundred and two counties representing all parts of the country, and in sixty-one of these counties that have been tabulated the face of the uncancelled records exaggerates, on the average, the true amount of the debt by 71 per cent. It was therefore decided to make a transcript of the record in every case for ten years and ascertain therefrom the average life of a mortgage.

Preliminary experiments by special agents of the Census Office pointed to the use of the average life of mortgages, with an allowance for partial payments, as promising results much nearer the truth—near enough, at any rate, to be fairly conclusive as to the amount of existing indebtedness. This plan is approximately correct, and under perfectly uniform conditions would produce accurate results. An objection that can be raised against it is that mortgages are not uniform in amount and number recorded each year. These variations, however, when large amounts of debt are considered, are not as great as may be supposed, and under careful observation and corrective treatment lose much of their influence for error. If the average life of all mortgages under such circumstances is four years, and the total amount of the mortgages recorded within the last four years is taken as equivalent to the amount of indebtedness existing at the present time, it is evident that many paid mortgages created within the four years are included within the amount, and that many unpaid mortgages created more than four years ago are not included. In such cases it is true, if the average life of mortgages is correctly represented, that the mortgages of the life period of four years now paid are exactly equal to the mortgages made previously to the life period and now unpaid, so that the total recorded debt of the life period stands for the amount of debt in force.

Our agents were therefore instructed to abstract for every real-estate mortgage acknowledged and received within the ten years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ended December 31, 1889 (except mortgages made by public and quasi-public corporations), the following facts: The State and county in which the mortgaged real estate is situated; the year in which the acknowledgement was made; corporations, both as mortgageors and mortgagees, classified as savings banks, banks (including loan and trust companies, but not including savings banks), building and loan associations, insurance companies, mortgage corporations, and all others; the original amount of the debt; the actual rate of interest, or, if not ascertainable from records, the customary rate at the time; the number of encumbered acres and city or village lots; and also, for the cancelled mortgages of 1880–83, the full dates of acknowledgment and cancellation.

For the purpose of checking this inquiry, special investigations were conducted in one hundred and two counties well distributed throughout the United States, and representing every phase of American life and industry. In these counties the same facts were taken from the records as in other counties, and also, for all uncancelled mortgages as far back in time as any appreciable number of them were found in force, the names and addresses of the parties. Schedules were sent to these persons, and in each one of these counties an exact statement of existing debt has been compiled. The enormous cost would preclude this method for the whole country, but work in what are termed "inquiry" counties has been of great service in correcting the work elsewhere. The "inquiry" counties also reveal the purposes for which the debt was incurred. By far the largest proportion of real-estate mortgage debt has been incurred to secure the purchase of land, and the cost of improvements stands second in importance. The security of purchase money is generally 50 to 75 per cent. of the real-estate mortgage debt of the people of a county, and improvements generally represent from 10 to 20 per cent. of the debt.

A study of the table given above brings out the fact that the State of Kansas has, relatively speaking, a greater burden of indebtedness than any other of the five States in which the tabulation has been completed. Those who have taken up the debt cry for political purposes are apparently directing their entire energies to this State. Naturally the people of Kansas are considerably aroused on the subject, and, while admitting that the bur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

den of debt is great, vigorously protest at being made "a frightful example" for the rest of the Union. The people of Kansas might retaliate that debt is not always a sign of decay, but often an indication of prosperity; they might say the debt of Chicago is $24,373,170 more than the farm debt of Kansas, $42,703,564 more than the farm debt of Iowa, and $112,068,830 more than the entire mortgage debt of Alabama and Tennessee, and yet Chicago is one of the most prosperous cities in the Union to-day. And again they might with truth point out that the bulk of the debt in Alabama and Tennessee, the two Southern States tabulated, may be found in the counties in which are located Birmingham, Knoxville, Nashville, and Chattanooga, where the great industrial progress has taken place during the decade. The relation of the mortgage indebtedness to the true value of property is an element that should not be ignored in estimating the burden of debt. The estimate of $1,646,000,000 as the true value of all property, taxed and not taxed, for the State of Kansas is warranted by the facts. The mortgage indebtedness of the State, aggregating as it does $235,485,108, would therefore be 14.31 per cent. of the true valuation of all property in the State. In this estimate no account is taken of taxable property escaping taxation, which, in all communities, is known to be considerable.

Far be it from me to underestimate the burden of this debt. Still the people of Kansas have lots of pluck, unbounded energy, broad acres, great productive powers, and honestly intend to pay their debts. They will surely extricate themselves. The discussion of the subject, the gloomy prophecy of demagogues, and the facts as given by the Eleventh Census will bring the people to their sober senses, and a time of retrenchment and debt-paying will, I hope, be ushered in with a bountiful harvest this year.

In this article I have principally confined myself to the recorded real-estate indebtedness. The result of the direct inquiry as to the debt on farms and homes is not yet completed. The average farm and home debt, shown by tabulation of partial returns from counties distributed throughout the Union, is $1,288 for farms and $924 for homes. If these averages hold good for the United States, there is an existing debt in force of $2,500,000,000 on the farms and homes of the United States occupied by owners. Only some rough results of this inquiry are now known. It is probable that the number of families occu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pying and owning mortgaged farms and homes does not exceed 2,250,000, leaving perhaps 10,250,000 families that hire their farms and homes or occupy and own them free of encumbrance. The total number of families occupying farms is supposed to be about 4,750,000, so that about 7,750,000 families occupy homes.

An attempt has been made in this article to give some conception of the magnitude of this one inquiry, and the unique results likely to be obtained. It has also been pointed out that, aside from the statistical results, which some of the most distinguished statisticians now recognize are likely to be of great importance, the moral effect of such an investigation is worth to the country many millions more than its cost. The investigation and agitation, in my opinion, are sure to be followed by retrenchment and debt-paying. It must also be borne in mind that, while the public debt at certain periods in the financial history of our States and minor civil divisions has been mostly created on account of a vehement desire to construct public works, so has the prime motive in the private debt been better fences, better barns, better homes, and more land for the farmer.

ROBERT P. PORTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ITALY AND THE POPE.

BY EX-PRIME-MINISTER CRISPI.

Part I.

Italy has the privilege of possessing in her capital city the head of the Catholic Church. This privilege is certainly not envied her by other nations, because it means, not that we have with us a minister of God, who exercises pacifically his spiritual power, but that we have with us a pretender to the throne who conspires against the unity and the liberty of the country.

After the fall of the temporal power, the Pope failed to show the Christian virtue of obedience to the laws of Providence, and to take up again the functions of his sovereign pontificate under the conditions in which it existed in the first years of the institution. If he had done this, he would have been an element in the peninsula of order and of love; but in his actual attitude he is the cause of suspicion and of distrust, and he is regarded as an enemy against whom we are compelled to be on our guard, because, from one moment to another, he may disturb the public peace.

This abnormal state of things needs to be looked into from its beginning and in all its particulars. It is desirable to know the causes of this hostility of the church against the government which protects it and defends its independence; it is desirable to see if the Italian Parliament has gone far enough—nay, if it has not gone too far—in its concessions, since it has given special privileges to one of the religions of the state at the peril of its own existence.

On October 2, 1870, the citizens of the Roman provinces voted by universal suffrage their annexation to the kingdom of Italy. With that plebiscitum the nation completed politically its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unity. Italy has expiated with centuries of slavery the crime of having conquered the world. The barbarians whom our ancestors attempted to civilize not only invaded the peninsula, but they cut it up and distributed it among themselves, without ever having had the virtue to reconstruct it. They have always envied its ancient grandeur, watching over its movements continually, and preventing it, as far as they possibly could, from achieving its own reconstruction.

It does not concern my present purpose to narrate all the things that have happened from the fourth century of the Christian era down to our times. I take Italy in 1815, and I will say that after the great French Revolution was subdued, which had awakened the most legitimate hopes and desires, Italy found herself divided as before, and impotent to defend herself against new foreign invasions. She had no voice in the councils of Europe.

Under the first Napoleon Italy was thus divided: Piedmont and Liguria were French departments, governed by French prefects; Rome was an imperial city; Tuscany belonged to the Princess Elisa; Naples to Murat; Sicily and Sardinia, which had resisted the omnipotence of the great captain, remained under the power of Ferdinand the Bourbon and of Victor Emmanuel; Lombardy, the Venetian territory, the Trentino, the Emilia, and the Marches, constituted into a single principality, had received, as if in derision of right and of history, the name of the Kingdom of Italy.

No better would have been the fate of our country if the Emperor, in his last great battles, had come out conqueror over the European coalition. I have before me now a letter written by him on the 12th of March, 1814, which sets forth his final word about Italy. Joachim Murat, when the star of Napoleon seemed declining, had declared for the enemies of France, and on the 11th of January, 1814, he had signed an agreement of alliance, offensive and defensive, with Francis I. of Hapsburg. Napoleon, on learning of this treason, wrote fiery letters to the King and Queen of Naples, and then, wishing to attempt to extinguish his brother-in-law by giving him as much as he had expected to get from his agreement with Austria, he wrote, on the 12th of March, 1814, to Eugène Beauharnais conformably with the project which had been made for Eugène of an arrangement with his loyal associate, and the promise of the partition of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the peninsula into two large states. The imperial letter was of such importance that it deserves to be transcribed.

"My son," wrote the Emperor, "I send you a copy of a very extraordinary letter which I have received from the King of Naples. Such sentiments are really inconceivable at a moment when France and myself are being assassinated. I have also received a letter written by you, with the project of a treaty sent to you by the King. I wish you now to send to this traitor an extraordinary agent, and make a treaty with him in my name. Do not touch Piedmont and Genoa, and divide the rest of Italy into two kingdoms. Let this treaty be kept secret until the Austrians have been driven out of the country, and twenty-four hours after it has been signed let the King declare himself and attack the Austrians. You may take any action in this direction. You must spare nothing, in our actual situation, to add to our efforts the efforts of the Neapolitans. Afterwards we can do what we like, for after such ingratitude and in such circumstances nothing need bind us."*

As the two parties could not agree, the will of the Emperor was not carried out. It is probable, however, so far as concerns Italy, that Murat would have been the man of whom we should have had least to complain. In a letter of the 23d of March, 1814, in which Eugène Beauharnais gave the Emperor an account of his negotiations, we read the following words, the significance of which cannot escape the reader:

"The Neapolitans insisted on laying down, as their first article, that the kingdom of Italy should be bounded by the Po and the Taro. They would then have consented to the establishment of the kingdom of northern Italy, but under the express condition that I should have sent the French troops beyond the Alps. Genoa and Piedmont were to make part of the kingdom of southern Italy."†

However, events went on, and Napoleon, twice conquered and twice compelled to abdicate, took with him to St. Helena useless remorse and repentance for his past. If he had constituted Italy into political unity,—and he could have done this, because he had all the elements,—it never would have been possible that he should have been thus ungratefully abandoned by his royal brother-in-law; and the two nations, France and Italy, united and harmonious, under the command of a single chieftain, might have fought the common enemy and easily overcome him.

When the Congress of Vienna was opened, after Waterloo, one single thought animated the princes there assembled; this was to enchain the people, so that they could not repeat the revolution which for twenty-six years had agitated Europe. Metter-

*N. Bianchi, "Storia Documentata della Diplomacia Europea," Vol. I., p. 336.
†Ibid, p. 334.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nich, speaking to Pareto, who represented at Vienna the interests of Genoa, informed him that the fashion was not then for republics; and to Gonfalonieri, the envoy of Beauharnais, and to the Duke of Campochiaro, the minister of Joachim Murat, he declared, with a sufficiently visible delight, that there was no room for revolutionary dynasties. Another anecdote still better characterizes that historic period of our Italian life. It is the deliberate proposition entertained by the Emperor Francis I. as to the name which should be given to the states which were ceded to him. To Austria were given in great part the provinces which had constituted the kingdom of Italy. His imperial, royal, apostolical majesty accepted the gift, but did not wish to take the name, because the words "Kingdom of Italy" were revolutionary, and might excite hopes which it was desirable to prevent, and which perhaps it might be necessary to repress. The Pope was restored, and with all the old dynasties in their ancient dominions. A principality for her life was established for the Empress Maria Louisa. Genoa was given to the King of Sardinia. The cabinet of Vienna, to which the Bourbon King of Naples had communicated a project for the political reorganization of his states and the abolition of the Sicilian constitution, gave this project its approbation.

All this insane work could not stand; and five years afterwards revolts broke out, in the north and in the south of the peninsula, which, though they were promptly repressed by foreign arms, planted the seeds of new aspirations and of new struggles among the citizens.

The name of Italy, during the wars of the first republic and the first empire, had become a beacon and a hope to the Italian populations, and the more they were struck down the stronger became their desire to see reconstituted their ancient mother country, no matter how bitter had been their undeceptions. General Bonaparte, when he first crossed the Alps, had evoked in his proclamations the memories of the ancient queen of the world, and in the name of Rome he had invited these enslaved populations to rise again for the restoration of their common country. Similar language had been afterwards used by Lord Bentinck, appearing with his fleet on the Ligurian coasts and calling upon the population to rise against the tyrant. Not less explicit had been the manifesto of King Joachim Murat in March, 1815, when, seeking the support of the Italians for the redemption of their land, he re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minded them that the boundaries of the nation had been the inaccessible Alps and the sea. Finally, we must not forget a fact which dominates all other facts in the Neapolitan epopee, and that is the coronation of the Emperor and King of Italy on the 25th of May, 1805. The powerful despot, putting upon his head the iron crown, inspired the multitude, always easy to be deceived, with the hope that this was the beginning of the great work which could not long fail of accomplishment.

These modern memories were not without fruit for a people which lives upon classic thought. Publicists and poets kept alive in the hearts of the people the image of their country. In the schools, scholars and masters took part in this holy conspiracy of literature; and from Virgil to Dante, from Filicaja to Alfieri, from Foscolo to Leopardi, one hymn went up,—the misery in which Italy was kept, the necessity of insurrection to revive the ancient mother of the world, who had been condemned to be a slave whether victorious or vanquished. These voices of the soul had sufficed to establish the consciousness of their own duties in the hearts of the new generation, when arose Mazzini, apostle and conspirator, to organize the national forces for the day of deliverance.

Bitter but constant, despite the gallows and exile, was the life of Italy for forty years. Insurrection followed insurrection. Neither bloodshed nor repression availed to weary the people, who were always more bold, more determined, more unterrified, in the face of their tyrants. The year 1848, the year in which a spark from Palermo set fire to all Europe, appears to mark the end of the despots and the restoration of the nation. The treachery of princes and quarrels among the people, which gave the foreigners fresh opportunities to enchain them, made all our heroism useless and all our sacrifices of men and money vain. Charles Albert beaten at Novara, Venice and Rome trampled under foot by Austria and France, Italy fell back under the power of princes who for ten years longer kept up their ancient dominion, governing worse than before. Political protests against this oppression were the only relief of the people, and these were repeated until the day at last came of triumph and redemption.

As appears throughout what I have already said, the work of preparation was long and tempestuous; but fortunately, as we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall see, the work of redemption was rapidly completed at last, since, in the course of twelve years, Italy succeeded in bringing herself together and accomplishing her unity. All the elements of the nation took part in this, even the least promising and the most unfavorable. Even errors and disasters were fruitful of good. The obstinacy of our tyrants was our good fortune, and foreign ambitions, for the most part fantastic, turned to our advantage. Our destiny was ripe; and the harmony of our people and the efforts of a king, citizen and soldier in one, concurred, in the fulness of time, to bring about our deliverance. This work began with the war of 1859, which in its consequences went far beyond the expectations of him who had inaugurated it. Napoleon threw his armies into Italy with a somewhat limited programme, and he had not the strength to execute it within the terms and under the conditions established by the treaty of Plombières, December, 1858. When he closed the war at Villafranca, he wished to establish a confederation of princes, but events were too strong for him. It came to pass that after the war was declared, and the Austrians had left the central provinces of the peninsula, the Emilia and Tuscany rose in arms, and the little dukes and the pontifical legates were constrained to fly.

The echo of this popular triumph came from the dominions of the Bourbon King. On the 4th of April, 1860, Palermo rose in arms, and on the 5th of May Garibaldi appeared in Sicily with his thousand men, fought, conquered, and in less than six months nine millions of Italians were freed from tyranny and united themselves to the nation.

In order that the revolutionary tempest might not reach the Tronto, and that the patrimony of St. Peter might be safe, General Cialdini was ordered to occupy the marches of Umbria. Nevertheless a people of twenty-five millions was gathered together and on the 17th of March, 1861, the Italian Parliament was enabled to proclaim the constitution of the kingdom of Italy.

Never had fortune smiled upon Italy as from 1859 to 1861. Austria had been defeated and had no allies; France had departed from the peninsula which she had liberated, and could not change her programme and turn against Italy the arms which had been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taken up against our enemies. It was thenceforth impossible that there should be any military agreement between the rival powers to impose upon us the treaty of Zurich. Their forced inertia secured our salvation. The enemies of our unity being impotent, popular movements and the annexations resulting from them could incur no hostility from foreign action.

After the Parliamentary act which manifested the unanimous will of the nation, the powers recognized the new kingdom. In this state of affairs only one more effort was necessary, and the edifice, to the erection of which God and man had contributed, would be completed and crowned. The war of 1866, fought on both sides of the Alps, gave us Venice; and in 1870, the French troops, which were the only obstacle, being withdrawn,—an obstacle more political than material in the way of our liberty of action,—Rome came to Italy.

Before 1870, in a period of years which we may call our own, the temporal power of the Popes had been thrice abolished,—in 1798 by the people assembled at the capital after the entrance into Rome of the French troops under General Berthier; on the 17th of May, 1809, by a decree of Napoleon I.; and on the 9th of February, 1849, by a law of the Roman republic. The decrees of the 9th of October, 1870, and the law of the 31st of December of the same year were not, therefore, an innovation. We can only praise the exceptional mildness of the Italian Government and Parliament shown in an act of such importance.

In 1798 and in 1809 the Pope was absolutely driven from Rome; and when the fate of the first empire hung in the balance and the conflict became more ardent, Napoleon sent Pius VII. to the advance posts of the army to keep him in check and perhaps to expose him to the fury of the French armies. In a letter written by the Emperor on the 12th of March, 1814, to Prince Eugène, I find these memorable words:

"I have given orders that the Pope should be sent by the way of Piacenza and Parma to the advance guard. I have given the Pope to understand that when he asked, as Bishop of Rome, to be allowed to return to his diocese, I gave him the permission. Be careful, therefore, not to enter into any negotiations about the Pope as to either recognizing or not recognizing him as sovereign."*

I do not wish to anticipate what I have to say about the papacy a little further on, but I feel that I should not close here

* N. Bianchi, Vol. I., p. 336.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this series of recollections of the French Revolution, and from what I have already said it will appear natural that I should bring the papacy face to face with our times, in order to show how unjust is the war waged by the Vatican against Italy.

In less than two lustres the French Revolution, in respect of religion and worship, assumed of all possible phases the most absurd; but its tendency was always the same in its laws and in its decrees—to use religion as an instrument of government. This began in 1790 with the civil constitution of the clergy, which sanctioned the abolition of church property, the popular election of ecclesiastical functionaries, the dependence of the Holy See on the French bishopric, and the oath imposed upon the clergy to support the laws of the state.

Afterwards, when Louis XVI. had been beheaded under the republican programme, Christianity was abolished, which was bad, and the new faith was substituted, the worship of Reason, which was worse. Religion neither can nor should be maintained by governments nor made a political institution. Religion is born of faith and of the conscience; and faith and the conscience alone should nourish and sustain it. Citizen Robespierre, the high priest and dictator, was a melancholy imitation of the pope-king, and quite as melancholy it was to see the existence of the republic guaranteed by proscription. Eight years afterwards Catholicism was restored by the first consul, but it was under conditions which made the clergy the nominees and the stipendiaries of the government, so that the ecclesiastical policy of the country was exclusively controlled by the civil authorities, and jurisdiction over the priests was exercised by the Council of State.

Pius VII. accepted this state of things in the Concordat of 1801, and he gave fresh importance to it in 1804, when, moved by ambitious desires of temporal advantage, he went to Paris to consecrate and crown the new Emperor. He made a mistake, for he did not receive back the territory which Pius VI. had lost at the treaty of the Tolentino, and the provinces which had remained in the power of the Holy See were taken away from him by the decree of May 17, 1809. All this, of course, irritated the Roman pontiff and made him an enemy of the monarchy which he himself had canonically legitimatized.

After this, reasons of state imposed a somewhat rigorous necessity of precautions against which the pontifical curia, discon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tented with the new order of things, began conspiring against the established government. Napoleon abolished all ecclesiastical jurisdictions, the holy office, all the barbaric institutions with which the Pope is surrounded, and, annexing the states of the holy church to France, extended to them the political system of 1789. Pius VII. then shut himself up in the Quirinal, assuming the attitude of a prisoner, and replied to the civil action of the French Government by publishing a bull of excommunication, in which Napoleon was not named, but was plainly indicated, because the spiritual thunder was hurled against all who had refused to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, and against the authors and accomplices of all acts of spoliation committed upon the patrimony of St. Peter. It is clear that after this the strife between the two powers necessarily must have become more intense.

On the 17th of June, 1809, Napoleon wrote Murat :

"You will have seen by my decrees that I have done the Pope a great deal of good, but only on the condition that he will keep quiet. If he undertakes to make a combination of caballeros and conspirators, like Cardinal Pacca and the rest, this shall not be tolerated, and I shall act at Rome as I have acted with the cardinal archbishop of Paris. I wish to give him this explanation. You must speak plainly to the Pope and not allow any sort of difficulty. The military commissions must do justice on the monks and on anybody else who commits any excesses." *

Two years afterwards, in another letter, the Emperor added :

"I let you know that my intention was to have things move rapidly at Rome and to make no terms with any kind of opposition. No asylum whatever shall be respected if there is resistance to my decrees, and no resistance must be suffered on any pretext whatever. If the Pope, against the spirit of his position and of the gospel, preaches revolt and undertakes to use the immunity of his house to have circulars printed, you must arrest him. The time for this sort of thing is over. Philippe le Bel had Boniface arrested, and Charles V. kept Clement VII. a long time in prison, and these had done less. The priest who preaches discord and war against temporal powers, instead of peace, abuses his authority." †

Deeds followed words. On the 6th of July, 1809, at three o'clock in the morning, the French *gendarmes* scaled the walls of the Quirinal, went in through the windows, and reached the apartments of Pius VII. He was arrested in his sacerdotal dress, put into a carriage, driven from city to city, from Florence to Alexandria, because no one wished to receive so inconvenient a prisoner, and when he reached Grenoble he was sent back again to

* Thiers's "History of Consulate and Empire," Brussels edition, Milene, Vol. III., p. 261.

† Ibid.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy by the order of the Emperor, who wrote as follows to his Minister of Police:

"It is my intention that the Pope shall not come into France. If he is still on the Riviera of Genoa, the best place where he can be put is Savona. There is there a sufficiently large house where he might be properly lodged until we know what is to be done. If he gets over his lunacy, I have no objection to his being sent back to Rome." *

In consequence of this, Pius VII. was taken to Savona, but Napoleon did not get the satisfaction he required, and, changing the intention he had at that time expressed, to wit, that the Pope ought to have a residence of his own, he conceived the plan that Paris should be the centre of the two powers, temporal and spiritual. Thereupon he ordered the removal to Paris of the cardinals, of the generals of all the religious orders, of the functionaries of the Roman chancery, of the *dateria*, and of the *penitenzieria*, and he ordered the removal to Paris of the pontifical archives. To this end the Emperor wrote to the Minister of Police, on the 15th of September, 1809:

"I have already given orders that all the generals of the orders and the cardinals who have no bishopric or do not receive any honor, whether they be Italians or Tuscans or Piedmontese,† shall come to Paris; and probably I shall make an end of all this by bringing here the Pope himself, whom I shall establish somewhere in the environs. It is proper that he should be at the head of Christendom."‡

After the decree and the law which abolished the temporal power of the Pope, Italy did nothing of this kind. The Pope for twenty years has been living in the Vatican, surrounded by the cardinals, by the functionaries of the church, inviolable and unviolated, a constant and incorrigible conspirator.

Of the political institutions which arose in Europe during the middle ages, the most absurd were the monastic and ecclesiastical. To the feudal system, which had for itself the mere argument of force, to the king who held supreme authority, the church was not content to oppose its spiritual power, and when it could it wished to unite with this a temporal power. Germany was the country in which, more than elsewhere, these ecclesiastical states abounded; there were more than thirty of them, the titular chiefs of which were electors of the empire, and three of these,

* Ibid, p. 263.

† It will be observed that to Napoleon the Piedmontese and the Tuscans were not Italians.

‡ Thiers's "History of Consulate and Empire," Vol. III., p. 263.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most powerful archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne, were arch-councillors of the empire. France and Belgium had such prelate-kings; Italy also had some. To these we must add the religious corporations, which also exercised civil power, and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem and that of the Teutonic Knights. In the one and in the other of these orders the members were monks and soldiers, and their chief was invested with civil sovereignty. The papacy was at the head of all, and had under it, in France, Avignon with the Venousin; in Italy, the territory which bore the name of the patrimony of St. Peter.

It is not necessary to recall the origin of these dominions; it is sufficient to observe that they were swept away by the hurricane of the French Revolution, and the only one of them restored in 1815 was the Holy See. Napoleon, in his decree of the 17th of May, 1809, to establish the legitimacy of his authority,—he, the restorer of the Western Empire,—recalled the fact that Charlemagne had established Rome and the provinces as a feudal part of his own monarchy. Italy has quite another reason, more logical, more powerful, which makes truly legitimate her abolition of the civil authority of the holy church. We have no need to discuss the authenticity of the imperial donations or the false decretals or the violent acts of Julius II., or the astute manœuvres of his successors. The Pope for us had no greater rights than the other princes whom we dispossessed.

The origin of the dynastic states was the same. It was the treaty of 1815, or, in other words, it was foreign violence. The day on which Italy established her political unity it ceased to be possible that Rome should remain outside of the national orbit. No fragment of the territory of our country can be excluded from the common life or condemned to slavery. Its reintegration is a question only of time, but the right cannot be contested. Let us add that by tradition and by its prestige, after the new kingdom was established, it became the only capital before which the other great cities—Naples, Florence, Turin, Milan—could lay down their legitimate mission.

And I have some other not less important considerations to submit to the consideration of my readers. Rome under the Pope was a gangrene spot which must have poisoned the whole body of the nation. From 1860 onward it had become the asylum of all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fallen dynasties, a cave of brigands who infested the southern provinces of the peninsula. This being stated, the redemption of the Eternal City was not only a logical consequence of the restoration of Italian right; it was necessary to the pacification of the country.

For a people, the right to exist in freedom and independence long antedates any reason of princes or any international treaty. Conquest, usurpation, the insidious good luck of a despot, may suspend the exercise of this right, but they do not diminish it; much less can they slay it. Eternal, imprescriptible, within its natural limits, the nation reassumes its own autonomy almost as soon as it has freed itself from the grasp of sacerdotal and civil tyranny.

The question of the temporal power of the Pope has troubled for many years the minds of all Italian statesmen. Certainly it has been for us the most difficult to deal with in consequence of the character of universality which the head of the church possesses in virtue of his mission. When Cavour had determined that the temporal power must come to an end, through pacific means and by an agreement with the Catholic world, that illustrious minister was the first in our time to undertake seriously the study of means to achieve this end. He died too soon to witness the failure of his policy. Garibaldi was prevented from cutting the Gordian knot; but without the cannon the Porta Pia would never have been opened to the nation to take possession of its capital.

From contemporary publications and from the correspondence of Cavour, issued by Rue & Co. at Turin, it appears that so early as 1860 the great minister had attempted to open negotiations with the Holy See. This explains the motive with which Baron Ricasoli then dispersed the Garibaldian legion which had been collected in Tuscany to invade the Roman territory. Count Cavour made a confidant of Dr. Diomed Pantaleoni, whom he describes, in a letter of October, 1856, as the most faithful and most distinguished expression of the Liberal Moderate party.* Later on were associated with Dr. Pantaleoni, Passaglia and Bertelli, general of the Rosminians. In the Holy College, Cardinals Santucci and d'Andrea were favorable to an understanding between the Holy See and Italy. Communication with these

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. VI., p. 44.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cardinals was carried on through the Abbé Antonio Isaia, secretary of Cardinal d'Andrea. Before the 28th of September, 1860, Count Cavour had sent to Rome his proposals for an agreement in which guarantees should be given for the spiritual independence of the Pope and for the exercise of his spiritual authority in the Catholic world.*

At that time Cavour inquired whether it would not be well to unite Padre Pagani, another Rosminian, in the conduct of these negotiations, and if it would not be well to send a secret agent who should be intrusted with the whole secret thought of the government and the whole confidence of Cavour, so that we might succeed in securing a complete persuasion of the necessity of the proposals which this agent should be charged to make and to receive.

The basis of the agreement with the Holy See was to be the abandonment of the temporal power and the establishment of the King of Italy at Rome. As we shall see further on, Cavour was very liberal in the concessions he would have made to the Vatican. They were excessive, and we ought to thank God that they were not accepted. It appears that Pius IX. and Antonelli in the beginning hesitated over the suppression of the civil principality of the church. In a telegram of the 13th of January, 1861, which one of the negotiators sent to Rome, we read:

"Santucci, notwithstanding my objections, thought it his duty to tell everything to the Pope, who asked him what this project of agreement was. Cardinal Santucci spoke to him of the inevitable loss of the temporal power. The proposals were received in a friendly spirit. The Pope shows himself resigned to everything. Antonelli was called in. He at first opposed, but finally resigned himself also to the circumstances, and asked the Pope to release him and Santucci from their oath, in order that they might be able to treat about the possible surrender of temporal power. They will see Passaglia on Friday, the 13th, and he, on their behalf, asks me to have him nadem to officially negotiate, or, if not him, somebody else from this place or from Turin."†

The suppression of the temporal power was to be made in a form which had a flavor of feudalism. The Pope, reserving to himself the eminent domain, was to cede in perpetuity to Victor Emmanuel and to his successors the vicarate and civil government of the patrimony of St. Peter. The personal guarantees were to be all the prerogatives of sovereignty, assuring to the Pope per-

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. IV., p. 102.
† Ibid. p. 107.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal inviolability and immunity within his palaces, inviolability of the conclave and of the camerlengo during a vacancy of the Holy See ; the Pope to have the right to send nuncios and to receive legates from foreign governments and to enjoy, in respect of them, all personal and territorial immunity ; the Pope to receive for the maintenance of his court property sufficient to maintain the dignity of the Holy See. On the part of Rome it was asked, furthermore, that this agreement should be guaranteed by the Catholic powers in an international undertaking. But Count Cavour objected to consent to this. He replied that he would accept the good offices of the powers, but he could not admit any guarantee or other similar bond, which might give pretext for complications and foreign intervention. Other propositions were made to complete the first suggestions, in which other rights and greater prerogatives were asked for the clergy. Cavour did not oppose these, and, with some modifications, would have accepted them. †

CRISPI.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

† Ibid, p. 103.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

POSSIBILITIES OF WASHINGTON SOCIETY.

To a newcomer in Washington the social possibilities are delightfully suggestive. Where else, indeed, in our country are so many men of diverse powers congregated? And where else do such men mingle freely in society? They are of every shade of political opinion, of course, as well as representative of every interest in the country; for if the drawing-room is hardly as yet neutral ground, it offers a certain degree of hospitality to friend and to foe, and will do so with more and more cordiality, as it is realized that society, like patriotism, unites those whom politics divides.

To forward such harmony is to work in a good cause, and not only can this be done, but a true society can be formed which shall create and be created by a standard of taste wholesomely American. The foundation is already laid here as nowhere else in the United States for a society that shall include both sexes, the only kind worth having or that can be permanently maintained; a society that understands something of the importance of etiquette—a form of culture as necessary to good society as grammar is to language; a society, finally, in which persons one would go half across the continent to meet, rub shoulders with the humblest in the crush of a President's reception or at the house of a cabinet officer. But what is the result? One cannot deny that as yet it is entirely inadequate. Society as an end does not produce results commensurate with the means employed, and society as a means is not society in the true sense at all. It is, like any other transitory gathering at a theatre or hotel, without cohesion or significance. It gives birth to no *esprit de corps*, and failing in this any organization lacks persistence and loyalty. The individual simply loses his individuality and is merged in the mass, which becomes like a mush of grapes that have lost their wholeness as fruit and have not yet become wine.

At present, whatever lasts beyond the day of an entertainment is almost wholly of a utilitarian character. People must do this and that in order not to offend, in order to propitiate, in order to gain votes for the party or influence for a cause, or what not, that utilizes society for some other end than its own; whereas society should be the artistic product of a discriminating people, through the means of refined companionship.

This does not at all signify an attempt to imitate the French *salon*. One might as well try to revive the megatherium. The *salon* as France had it was a product of the times, which have changed in almost every detail since then. What America needs is a form of society that shall attract and preserve the best social material. Of course the form must be democratic, for that is the spirit of our age and people; but to be democratic does not signify that all men are alike either by nature or culture. Society cannot regard them, as the ballot does, solely from the standpoint of quantity; it must take cognizance also of quality. Green of Oxford is reported to have said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that to make every Englishman a gentleman was the aim of English civilization. This does not mean that the standard of what constitutes a gentleman should be lowered so as to admit every one without regard to his fitness, but that each one should be fit. The sharp retort of a lady on being asked to receive a boor who was praised for being "a diamond in the rough" might oftener be acted upon. "Then he should be cut," said she.

To be a gentleman is, however, within the power of almost every man. It does not mean to have wealth, nor to have power, nor to have even knowledge; in short, it is not having at all—it is being. A self-made man whose chief ambition it is to "represent" one or a hundred millions of dollars, or a hundred thousand votes, does not usually care to take the time and thought to make himself fit for presentation in society; though that a self-made man may be the truest gentleman is known through experience by most of us; and the method is ably shown in "John Halifax, Gentleman." On the other hand, a man of birth, education, and outward refinement should not be admitted in society if he can be impeached for conduct unbecoming a gentleman; and what is unbecoming is exactly what a true social standard must decide.

We need to cultivate strenuously a Greek sense of limits that shall know how to choose and refuse, and that shall not be afraid of choosing what is consistent with an enlightened conception of society as an end in itself, nor of refusing whatever conflicts with it. Any adequate standard must be based on character; not mental or moral character alone, but on the whole man or woman as he or she is. At present Washington society fritters away great opportunities, regardless of what might be achieved with a little thought and organized determination. Wealth, ostentation, political power, and the mere aggregation of numbers are fast suffocating the finer qualities of social life, fostering vulgarity, and blunting the sense of social taste. It is a delicate sense, and should be refined instead of dulled. To keep it pure and render it discriminating is no small part of patriotic duty, for the dangers of wealth and corruption are especially great to a republic.

The responsibility rests with the resident population of the capital. The society of official life is necessarily superficial, and impotent to make distinctions. It cannot choose whom it will exclude or receive, for officials are not only public servants, but are looked upon as public property. Moreover, they are here to-day and at the antipodes to-morrow, and can therefore have no adequate *esprit de corps*.

If, then, a dozen or twenty households, already well established, and possessors of both courage and a discriminating social taste, would form a league as quietly as might be to choose carefully whom they would invite and whom they would ignore, being guided solely by the motive of establishing a worthy social nucleus in the capital of the nation, they would create a permanent good, capable of growth and of incalculable refining and purifying influence on the future of the republic. It should base itself on a sound simplicity, so far as material things are concerned, in order that expense need be of little moment, and on an acute social sense of the congeniality of individuals and the temper of a gathering as a whole. It is said that in regard to eloquence the taste of the House of Commons is higher than that of the man of greatest taste within it. So it is with society. The refinement of attrition with equal minds, the wisdom that results from the blending of knowledge, the grace that comes from universal courtesy, and the easy assurance of those not afraid of committing a blunder—these are some of the gains such a social form would give to those capable of entering it. For it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should not be exclusive except of what would destroy it. It should be inclusive of all the good in the stream of people constantly flowing through the country. And what a stream this is to draw from! No other city offers us such advantages. If the nucleus were permanent, those invited might shift without injury to the central idea; and thus each turn of the political wheel would bring men of note from different parts of the nation who could be drawn in during their long or short tenure of office to brighten and enlarge the conservative brain of the organization; a common consciousness, alive to all changing impressions, yet capable of retaining the good of them permanently in a way that would waste nothing, but, on the contrary create continually new and higher forms. Under such circumstances, each individual would have the opportunity of bringing forth his or her best by union with the highest social achievements of all. Whether blossom or fruit, it should be welcome, for fragrance and beauty have their place no less securely than flavor and nourishment. Indeed, as Anglo-Saxons we can be safely trusted to take care of our nourishment, but we need stimulation to bring sufficient beauty into our lives. Surely, however, we are old enough as a social whole to have grown beyond the simple needs of the infant—food and warmth. These we can get at almost any entertainment, as also the satisfaction of the savage, who adds to the infant's wants those of clothing and shelter. Such demands are undeniably primitive. Let us strive for something more adequate to our desires as civilized human beings,—intelligent conversation, the play of minds at ease, the delicacy of gentle breeding, which far from leaving diamonds in the rough, makes jewels of common stones.

L. B. HALSTED.

THE HUMAN AMŒBOID.

WHEN my friend awoke the morning after a night at the club and facetiously spoke of himself as a "demoralized community," he probably did not intend to give a scientific description of himself. But that is exactly what his time-honored witticism was: he was literally a demoralized community.

Each of the millions of individuals which make up the grand resultant known as my convivial friend has a life-history of its own; each has its birth, followed by successive periods of growth, maturity, and decline, ending in death; and the night's festivities at the club had their demoralizing effect upon each individually, as well as upon the community collectively.

There is a scientific foundation for the town of Mansoul to rest upon that the Bedford Tinker never dreamed of in all his wonderful dreaming. Those embattled walls, with their eye-gate, their ear-gate, and all their other gates, the dwellings, strongholds, streets, alleys, and crowded population within, are more than the baseless fabric of a dream.

The individual in the microcosmic community is the amœboid cell. When it begins its life as a white blood-corpuscle, it is scarcely distinguishable from that little creature so familiar to the microscopist, the amœba. It swims along in the hæmal river, like a little fish in the Mississippi, in quest of food, oxygen, and its final destiny. What that destiny is to be there is nothing about it as yet to determine. As there is no telling whether a particular infant is to become doctor, lawyer, merchant, or priest, president or hod-carrier, so there is no telling in what sphere of usefulness this little creature may settle when it has finished its career of independent roaming. It may rise to a seat in the House of Lords, on the Supreme Bench, or in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Royal Academy, all of which august bodies hold their meetings beneath the cerebral dome; it may take a booth in one of the markets along the shores of the Alimentary Canal; it may go into the business of transportation in the Grand Cardiac Depot; into telegraphy on one of the Neural Lines; into the street-cleaning and garbage-removing department on Pulmonary Avenue, Renal Park, or Hepatic Square; its humble lot may be that of a common laborer in the Biceps Flexor or the Triceps Extensor, or, humblest of all, that of a half-alive, underground worker in the Bony System. But whether its lot be high or low, it will be one of absolute specialization.

The amœba has been called a zoölogical paradox, because it moves without muscles, feels and perceives without nerves, eats and digests without a mouth or stomach, breathes without lungs, gills, or branchiæ—in short, performs all the essential functions of a living being without organs. It is, however, no more truly a paradox zoölogically than the lowest races of savages are a paradox economically, who without being professional armorers arm themselves, without being professional tailors or mantua-makers clothe themselves (in a way), without being professional architects, farmers, provision-dealers, bakers, or fishermen, shelter and feed themselves. The savages simply are not armed, clothed, sheltered, or fed as well as those more favored classes who dwell in organized, differentiated society, where each individual has, or is supposed to have, his own special work to do, and to each of whom it is no reproach that he cannot do the work of other specialists.

It is not true that the amœba moves without muscle: the creature is itself a single muscular cell. Neither does it feel and perceive without nerves: its whole body is a single nerve cell. At the same time it is a digestive and assimilative cell, an oxygen-absorbing and carbonic-acid-excreting cell,—it may even be (as in the case of the *foraminifera*, which are only amœbæ secreting a limy test around themselves) a bone cell. Having so many diverse functions to perform all at once, it cannot, of course, excel in the performance of any one of them, as the savage Jack-of-all-trades, to whom we have compared it, cannot compete in the performance of any one of his numerous functions with his civilized and specialized brother.

If the amœba-like white blood-corpuscle roaming along the hæmal current is finally drafted as a recruit to some wasted muscle, it becomes at once specialized, its whole vital energy being concentrated upon its one duty of contracting or expanding at the bidding of its nerve-masters. So to whatever other tissue it may be attached, whether nervous, vascular, or osseous, for the remainder of its brief life all its energy is devoted to the performance of its single function.

As in the microcosm, so in the macrocosm: each individual is at first a white blood-corpuscle in the body politic. And the great organism of which he becomes (or may become) a mere specialized cell, exists not for his particular benefit, nor for that of any individual or class of his fellows, but for itself *as* an organism. As such it is improving at the expense of its individuals. It is making great and rapid strides in its mastery over the forces of nature, in its stores of information in all departments of knowledge, in the cultivation of art and artisanship. Men are better housed, lighted, warmed, clothed, and fed than ever before; they travel with greater speed, comfort, and economy; they are better protected from disease and violence; they have better means of intercommunication and exchange of commodities; in short, all the conditions of organized society are wonderfully improved, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are still improving with ever-increasing rapidity. And yet man as an *individual* is deteriorating, not in spite of, but in consequence of, these prodigious ameliorations in his condition.

Multiplying and magnifying the means of improvement and enjoyment, without at the same time correspondingly lengthening the term of life and enlarging the receptive capacity, offer but one advantage, that of *choice*; and this very advantage has the effect of increasing the tendency to specialization, which is only another name for narrowness. It does not swell the man into a larger sphere, but simply sharpens him to a finer point.

The world has already made too much history and eminent biography. The broadest mind, the most tenacious memory, can comprehend but the barest outlines, and for adequate study must content itself with fragments. The same applies to science, art, everything. Hence everywhere the race of man is told off into details. The intellectual class divides up its domain into lots, and assigns them to its settlers, as the United States Government assigns its territorial freeholds. The sky is partitioned off among astronomers like so much Western territory. In philology one man devotes his life to the third declension of one language, and at the end laments that he "has not confined himself to the dative case."

In the arts it is still worse. Time was when one man made a watch. Now he makes only one small part of it. As a result the product is greatly improved, but the *producer* is deteriorated in still greater degree.

Enlarging the scope of action in all directions, when the scope was already too large, has very much the same effect that enlarging the earth itself would have—it proportionately diminishes the individual actor.

When, countless æons hence, Jupiter and Saturn shall be inhabited, the Jovian and the Saturnian man will be as much smaller than the terrestrial man as those giant plants are greater than the earth. Not so, however, with the Jovian and the Saturnian races. For our hundreds they will number their tens of thousands. The amœboid cells which make up the body of a frog are larger than those of a man, and each may be capable of a greater diversity of action; but compare the resultants of their coördinated action!

Shall we lament the specialization and consequent deterioration of the individual man, which thus results in the higher differentiation and finer organization of the race as a whole? or shall we school ourselves to that philanthropy which can rejoice, not in the glory of a man, but of mankind?

This is the ideal philanthropy. The truly great philanthropist is as careless of the single life as nature herself where the welfare of the race is concerned. Who are the "unborn millions" for the sake of whom we give our lives by the thousands on the battlefield? We do not think of them individually. They are only the living, coördinated cells of a vast living, breathing organism whose name is Posterity. And when the health of that great Being is imperilled, we do not hesitate to be cut off and thrown away any more than the cellular fibres of our arm would rebel at the surgeon's knife. A man is a little thing, but "many a mickle maks a muckle."

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

NO STARVATION IN RUSSIA.

ON MY arrival in this country I find your journals discussing with much ability and natural fervor the brilliant prospect of a great influx of European gold into America to result from the enormous demand which Europe is ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pected to make upon the splendid harvests of your great West. I am not a merchant, and I do not pretend to know how large is the normal demand made by Europe upon your American grain fields. But I have passed very recently through the southern and western provinces of the Russian Empire, through Germany, through eastern France, and through Great Britain, on my way from the Caucasus to the United States. I have been told that the actual results of the harvest of 1891 in Germany, in eastern France, and in Great Britain are much better than were anticipated in the summer, and that no fear exists in any of those countries of an unusual dearth of cereal products. And I read with amazement that what is true of western Europe is not true of Russia. I read that the people are actually starving throughout a great part of the European dominions of the Czar; that the officers of the Russian army and the Russian nobility are retrenching their usual expenditure in order to avert a general famine, and even that the government of my country has forbidden the conservation of any grain for the sowing of next year's crops! If I did not know that three-fourths of the Continental press are now controlled by the Jews, and that the Jews are in possession of the great news agencies such as Wolff's and Reuter's, all this would astonish me indeed!

There are more than two million square miles of territory in European Russia inhabited by more than ninety millions of loyal subjects of the Czar. Out of this enormous area the crops of 1891 are bad in five *oblasts*, or provinces, to my knowledge, comprising less than 90,000 square miles, and inhabited by about eight millions of people. This means absolute distress in certain restricted regions. It means no more. There are districts of Ireland in which the potato crop is defective this year. There is a territory covering two million acres, called Oklahoma, I read, in your own great country, where there are no crops, and where human beings are dying of starvation. But Ireland is not famine-stricken in 1891, nor are the United States, nor is the Russian Empire. The ukase of the Czar forbidding the exportation of rye and oats has been made a pretext for this monstrous story. That ukase was issued for military reasons, not economical reasons. Since August 1 more than 300,000 Russian troops—a majority of them Cossack cavalry and light troops—have been moved into southwestern Russia from the East. There are now 640,000 troops of all arms established for precautionary and disciplinary purposes between Odessa and the Pruth and Warsaw. To secure the comfort and efficiency of this vast body of troops, the Russian Government gave orders months ago for the concentration in these provinces of adequate supplies of grain of the necessary kinds; and as it was notorious that the Jew grain-brokers always try to raise the domestic price, especially to the government, of grain, when they scent an unusual demand by forced exportations, the ukase forbidding such exportations was suggested by the able Imperial Finance Minister Vischnegradsky, approved by the Czar, and issued. I have seen the good effects of it in the healthy and vigorous appearance of the men and the horses of the forces under General Vladimiroff and General Grodno at every point of my recent journey. Disappointed of their profits in Russia, the Jews are perhaps now speculating in America on the effect of these tales of a great European famine and consequent great demand for American grain. I rejoice that you have so noble a harvest. I hope you will have a wide and remunerative sale for its golden treasures. But if the Germans and the Austrians who are now encouraging disloyalty in the cities of Poland count

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon a famine in Russia to weaken the arm of the empire, they count without their host.

SERGIUS V.

THE COMING GLACIAL AGE.

WHEN men are told that by far the stronger probability is that countless ages hence the solar system will be frozen to death than that it will be burned to death, their gaze is immediately turned groundward again. "After us the deluge," and that is long, long after the deluge.

Our pity for the woes of remote posterity is, if possible, feebler and more vague than that we feel for those who suffered in the remote past. The smallest members of the solar system, the moons, have already suffered glacial death. Can we shiver in sympathy with the last lunar equatorial inhabitants who may have held up their icy hands imploringly to the sun? As from cycle to cycle the sun shrinks more and more, and thus expends his vast stores of latent energy, planet after planet will succumb, we are told, until, last of all, the sun himself will go out in the blackness of darkness forever.

Forever? Then what will become of the enormous amount of expended energy? Speculative science has thus far offered no satisfactory answer to the question. The indestructibility of energy is a law of physics as well established as that of the indestructibility of matter. "Radiated into space" is no adequate explanation. Empty space, or, rather, the ethereal *plenum*, which is the only thinkable environment of masses of matter lighting and heating one another, held together by mutual gravitation, cannot retain within itself the smallest tremor of the energy it transmits, or else the most powerful telescope could never reveal to us the trembling ray that has been millions of years on its journey. The explanation that it is "dissipated and rendered unavailable in the form of heat"—in other words that all "strain and stress are relieved and equilibrium established"—is scarcely more satisfying. Its apparent fallacy may, perhaps, be made plain by a somewhat "violent" hypothesis. *Disce omnia ex uno.*

Let the whole universe be represented by two atoms, which we will suppose to be placed originally (say) one millimetre apart. Then the force of their mutual gravitation multiplied by one millimetre may represent the total potential energy of the universe at the beginning of the processes now going on. In obedience to their mutual attraction, they move toward one another with accelerating velocity. This motion may stand for all the phenomena which have occurred since the beginning; otherwise, for the conversion of the potential energy of the universe to kinetic energy. Finally, at their maximum velocity, the two atoms come into contact. This, of course, represents the period when the condensation of matter shall have reached its maximum, when all latent energy shall have been expended and "radiated into space." But will the two atoms remain in contact? No; by the inevitable law of dynamics they will rebound and return to their original positions, when the process will be repeated, and so on *ad infinitum.*

If two atoms would act thus, so would four atoms; so would millions Why not the universe itself? What is the true meaning of the term "unavailable energy"? What would correspond to it in the position or movements of the pair of atoms supposed?

WALTER J. GRACE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED